SOME REMARKS ON Three TREATISES OF THE PLAGUE:

VIZ.

I. Dr. *MEAD*'s Short Discourse concerning *Peſtilential Contagion.*

II. Dr. *MEAD*'s Short Discourse Explain'd, &c.

III. Dr. *PYE*'s Discourse of the *Plague*, &c.

Scribimus Indocti Doctique —— Hor.

LONDON;
Printed for J. Roberts, near the *Oxford-Arms* in *Warwick-Lane*. 1721.

PLAGUE:

THREE TREATISES

ON

REMARKS

SOME

REMARKS

ON

Three TREATISES

OF THE

PLAGUE.

INTRODUCTION.

THE Appearance of the Plague in the Southern Parts of *France*, the length of its Duration, and the terrible Havock it has made there, have juſtly given the Alarm to all *Europe*. Here in *England* the Parliament, laſt Seſſions, went on ſuch Means as were then judged moſt proper, to keep out from amongſt us ſo formidable an Ene-

my: And at preſent, the Danger of our being viſited with this ſore Affliction ſtill continuing, the Wiſdom of the Nation ſeems again intent on the ſame good Purpoſe; in conſidering what wholſome Laws may be farther enacted, either in order, if poſſible, to preſerve us from ſo great a Calamity as the Peſtilence; or, if that ſhould prove impoſſible, to enable the Government to ordain ſuch Regulations, as ſhall from time to time be judg'd fit and convenient, by the moſt ſkilful and able Phyſicians, to abate the Violence of this mighty Deſtroyer of Mankind.

But, what is more to my preſent Deſign, our Authors have not been ſparing of their Advice on this melancholy Occaſion; for *this* they have plentifully diſtributed, in many a Pamphlet, throughout the whole Kingdom. It is now near a Twelve-month ſince Dr. *Mead*, at the Requeſt of one of the Secretaries of State, publiſhed *A ſhort Diſcourſe concerning Peſtilential Contagion, and the Methods to be uſed to prevent it*. In that Treatiſe, the Doctor delivered it as his Opinion, That the Plague is no Native of our Country, but is generated only in the South and South-eaſt Parts of the World: That when it appears amongſt us, it happens by the Matter of Contagion, being imported hither in Goods from thoſe Places where it is generated, and meeting in theſe Parts with a ſuitable Diſpoſition of the Air, it ſpreads, and is rendred capable of infecting both ſuch Goods and Perſons as fall in its way. The Methods and Cautions the Doctor gives to prevent Contagion, are agreeable to this Opinion.

But

But ſince that Time, ſeveral Treatiſes have come abroad, whoſe Authors have thought fit to oppoſe theſe Notions of Dr. *Mead* with great Zeal. This Subject is of ſo much Concern to every body, that moſt People read all that is written about it; and ſeem to be very deſirous of getting what Light they can, in an Affair that occaſions them ſo much Uneaſineſs. The Opinion maintained againſt Doctor *Mead*'s Notions, appears to be the moſt agreeable to their Wiſhes; but then, on the other hand, almoſt the whole World have for a long Time thought otherwiſe; and a Miſtake in this Particular may be attended with the moſt fatal Conſequences. The Generality of Readers, I have obſerved, in this Point ſeem to have no ſettled Opinion; but are apt, in ſome meaſure, to incline to the Sentiments of the laſt Author they have peruſed. This Wavering in Judgment ariſes chiefly from a Negligence in conſidering what is offer'd on either ſide; as few carry in their Minds the Subſtance of all they formerly read, or take the Pains to compare one Treatiſe with another; if they did, they would readily perceive both the Weakneſs of many Arguments they for a while look'd upon as unanſwerable, and how it is frequent with the Writers themſelves, to miſrepreſent the Expreſſions of thoſe they write againſt. I therefore thought, it might be no uſeleſs Labour to publiſh ſome *Remarks*, both on what Dr. *Mead* and on what ſome of his Oppoſers have already preſented the World with in relation to Contagion; hoping, that thereby every common Reader would, in ſome degree, be aſſiſted in diſcovering, on what ſide of

the

the Queſtion there is the greateſt Appearance of Truth.

The Pamphlets written againſt Dr. *Mead* are too numerous to be all taken Notice of; and indeed I ſhall here make uſe of two only, which are the laſt I have read on this Subject; as being ſufficient, I believe, for the Purpoſe I at preſent aim at. The firſt does not acquaint us with its Author's Name; the Title of it is, *Dr.* Mead's *ſhort Diſcourſe explained, or, his Account of Peſtilential Contagion, and Preventing, exploded.* The other Pamphlet is, *A Diſcourſe of the Plague, wherein Dr.* Mead's *Notions are conſider'd and refuted, by* George Pye, *M. D.*

In proſecuting the Deſign I have undertaken, I ſhall obſerve the following Method: Firſt I ſhall ſeparately and diſtinctly produce ſuch Paſſages out of theſe two laſt mention'd Authors, as I think fit to be conſidered; and then immediately ſubjoin a *Remark*, which will often contain in it thoſe Places in Dr. *Mead*'s Diſcourſe, which the foregoing Paſſages were intended by their Authors to invalidate. I ſhall, for the moſt part, cite the very Words of theſe three Writers; but if at any time, for Brevity's ſake, I ſhall give their Opinions in other Expreſſions, which I have very ſeldom done; I hope, upon comparing them with the Paſſages referred to in the Authors themſelves, the Reader will find I have not wilfully at leaſt miſrepreſented their Senſe. I am ſenſible, I have omitted ſeveral Particulars that might have been remarked; but as I was afraid of being too tedious, ſo I am perſuaded, that ſuch as I have obſerved will be judged ſufficient.

SECTION

SECTION I.

I Shall begin with the Gentleman that takes upon him to be Dr. *Mead*'s *Explainer*, as his Performance was publiſhed before Doctor *Pye*'s.

Explainer, in the Preface. 'The following 'Remarks I deſigned only as a *Proteſt* againſt 'the *Defects* of his (*viz.* Dr. *Mead*'s) Method 'of Writing, *&c.* That contemporary Phyſi-'cians abroad, and they who are to ſucceed 'us in After-ages, may not take Meaſures of 'our Knowledge in Phyſick in this Iſland, and 'in this Period of Time, from the mean Per-'formances of an Author, who writ by Pub-'lick Authority.

Remark. I ſet down this Paſſage, to ſhew the Vanity and Conceitedneſs of this Writer. What Opinion he ought to have of his Performance, will appear by and by.

Explainer, in the Preface. 'Many of the 'Faculty became eaſily appriz'd of the Errors 'and unfair Quotations, that were candidly 'mark'd out to them; (*viz.* in Dr. *Mead*'s Diſcourſe.)

Remark. Theſe many of the Faculty ought to have been named, or elſe we may certainly conclude they were none of Note; nor indeed has this Author been able to produce any Errors, or unfair Quotations, out of the Doctor's Treatiſe.

Explainer,

Explainer, ibid. 'The Doctor himſelf was 'brought to confeſs many Particulars, and 'ſtood convicted; for he had it reported, 'that he only deſigned his Diſcourſe for a '*Politick Account* of the Plague, and how it 'may be ſtaved off by *Force of Arms*.

Remark. The former Part of this Sentence ought to have been proved: For if the latter Part means only, that Dr. *Mead* deſigned his Diſcourſe chiefly to inform the Government, what Methods were moſt proper to keep the Plague out of our Country, it is a Reflection every one muſt make, who reads the Doctor's Book; if it means any more, as would ſeem by the Words made uſe of by this *Explainer*, it is doubtleſs a great Falſhood.

Explainer, ibid. 'Surely never Man plead-'ed Want of Time with a worſe Grace; for 'the Work was near three Months upon his 'Hands.

Remark. A raſh Aſſertion, without any Proof at all: However, the Doctor might have but few Intervals of Leiſure to compoſe his Book in, during the Time it lay upon his Hands.

Explainer, ibid. 'The Faults are not the 'Defects of Hurry, but oftner of being at 'too great Leiſure.

Remark. This I do not well underſtand: Were there any miſtaken Quotations, they are a very natural Effect of Hurry.

Explainer, ibid. 'Was it not as eaſy for 'the Doctor to report, from Dr. *Hodges*, that 'the Summer 1665 was *cool* and *moderate*, as 'that it was *hot* and *ſultry*?

Remark. Where does Dr. *Mead* charge Dr. *Hodges* with ſaying, that Summer was hot and ſultry?

Explainer, ibid. 'Why ſhould he, (Doctor *Mead*) 'miſreport the third Line of *Hodges*'s 'Book; and tell us, that the Plague began in '*Auguſt* 1664, and not in the laſt of *Decem-*'*ber* that Year?

Remark. Had Dr. *Mead* ſaid this, it would have been no Miſrepreſentation of *Hodges*, unleſs he had quoted him for it: Yet Dr. *Mead* no where ſays this, but that it began in *Autumn* 1664 (p. 29.) and there are ſome now in being, and were then alive, who affirm it appeared in *September* that Year. This therefore is a manifeſt Calumny, in charging Dr. *Mead* with *ſuborning Vouchers*. Beſides, it appears from the Bills of Mortality for the Year 1665, that Dr. *Hodges* was miſtaken; for thoſe Bills begun from the 20th of *December* 1664, and the yearly Bill ſhews ſix to have died of the Plague before the Time included within that Bill: Conſidering therefore the ſlow Progreſs the Plague in the Beginning made, it is not unlikely that it might firſt appear in *September*.

Explainer, ibid. 'He (Dr. *Mead*) might, 'indeed, have *neglected Contagion*, but he could 'not fairly *drop* it.

Remark. He has not dropt it, but very fully ſhewn the Laws to which it is ſubject. Had Dr. *Mead* neglected it, he had neglected the principal Ground upon which all Cautions to keep out the Plague are founded.

We have now done with the *Explainer*'s Preface, in the laſt Paragraph of which he apologizes for the Heat whereby he was actuated during his Writing, at the ſame time he ſeems to be very much under the Influence of it: for he concludes his Preface with pure Nonſenſe. We ſhall now proceed to examine his Book.

Explainer, p. 1, 2. 'He (Dr. *Mead*) tells his 'Patron that he rather chuſes to *put down* 'the principal *Heads of Caution*, than a Set of 'Directions in Form. What this Head may 'be, that affords us no *Directions*, is hard to 'gueſs.

Remark. Can this Head afford us no Directions, becauſe thoſe Directions are not put down in Form?

Explainer, p. 2. 'We are promiſed effectual 'Methods of *ſuppreſſing Infection here*.

Remark. This is falſe; we are only promiſed proper Methods; it is no where in Dr. *Mead*'s Diſcourſe affirmed, they will certainly be effectual: If they are the beſt that can be uſed, as I am confident they are, it is ſufficient.

Explainer, p. 2, 3. 'We find he (Dr. *Mead*) 'thinks it *neceſſary to premiſe ſomewhat in ge-* 'neral concerning Contagion, and the Manner 'by which it acts. But this is not enough; 'unleſs he does it ſo as was never done here 'formerly, nor by Phyſicians Abroad.

Remark. This Dr. *Mead* no where promiſes; but yet it is very true, for theſe Points were never well explained before.

Explainer,

Explainer, p. 3. ‘ Nothing follows (*viz.* in Dr. *Mead*'s Book) ‘ either concerning Contagion, or the Manner of its acting.

Remark. This is a groſs Falſity. Is not the firſt Part of Dr. *Mead*'s Diſcourſe chiefly about the Cauſes that ſpread the Plague, and conſequently of the Contagion which accompanies it? And is it not ſhewn, in Pages 15, 16, how the contagious Atoms ſeize a ſound Perſon; that is, the Manner by which Contagion acts? Dr. *Mead* has not indeed gone about to prove in Form the Exiſtence of Contagion, that being needleſs.

Explainer, p. 3. ‘ The moſt antient and ‘ beſt Phyſicians knew nothing of *Contagion*, ‘ and far leſs of *Peſtilential Contagion*; Words ‘ only brought in by Phyſicians in later Times, ‘ and of Ignorance.

Remark. The Uſe of the Word *Contagion*, or *Infection*, which ſignifies the ſame Thing, is no Mark of Ignorance, but neceſſary to expreſs a real Thing. I ſuppoſe, it will not be doubted, that the Small Pox is contagious, and much leſs that the *Lues Venerea* is ſo; tho' both theſe Diſtempers were unknown to the moſt antient Phyſicians. The Words are uſeful, and likewiſe rightly apply'd (in the Opinion of moſt Men) to the Plague.

Explainer, p. 4. ‘ What a propagating Cauſe ‘ may be, ſhall be left to thoſe that deal in ‘ Metaphyſicks to determine; it matters not ‘ what it appears to be, while the begetting ‘ Cauſe is unknown.

Remark. Is it improper to ſay, the Plague is ſpread, that is, propagated, by certain Cauſes; or is it ſpread by no Cauſe? And are

not the Cauſes of its being ſpread from the Southern Parts where it is bred, of more Conſequence to us to know, in order for keeping it off, than the Cauſes which breed, or, if you will, which beget it there?

Explainer, p. 5. ‘ Here he miſrepreſents ‘ his Authors; for *Hippocrates* is thought by ‘ many Writers not to treat of the Plague, in ‘ his third Book of Epidemicks.

Remark. Dr. *Mead* thinks theſe Writers miſtaken, and agrees with thoſe who are of a contrary Opinion; and is there no Difference between miſrepreſenting an Author, and differing from him in Opinion? *Galen* ſays of this Place of *Hippocrates*, Κοινῆ γάρ τινα ἔθνεσι πολλοῖς ξυμβᾶσαν λοιμὸν τὸν διήγησιν ἐν τούτοις ποιεῖται*; that is, That *Hippocrates* in this Place, gives the Hiſtory of a certain Plague which ſpread over many Countries.

Explainer, p. 6. ‘ It is manifeſt from *Hip-* ‘ *pocrates*, that this, and many other Alterations of the Air, do not make it contagious.

Remark. ‘ Dr. *Mead* does not think they do; for he ſays, p. 14. “ That *Infection* is not “ received from the Air it ſelf, however pre-“ diſpoſed, without the Concurrence of ſome-“ thing emitted from *infected* Perſons.”

Explainer, p. 6. ‘ His chief Article about ‘ Carcaſſes is abſolutely falſe, as may be prov-‘ ed by one of the beſt Phyſicians in any ‘ Age.

Remark. Should not this Phyſician have been named, and the Proof made out from him? For I am ſo far from thinking this

* *Galen.* in tertium Epidem. comment. tert.

Article, upon this Aſſertion only, to be falſe, that I believe it, as Dr. *Mead* calls it, the chief.

Explainer, p. 6, 7. ‘ But what is all this to ‘ Contagion breeding the Plague?

Remark. Nothing at all; for Dr. *Mead* does not ſay, that Contagion breeds the Plague, but only that it ſpreads it. But this is very much to the Original of the Plague, of which he has given ſome Hints, as being of Uſe in the main Deſign.

Explainer, p. 7. ‘ It is needleſs to enter upon this Hint of a new *Hypotheſis*; for if his ‘ Machine of Contagion, or Infection, be ‘ good, theſe (viz. *Stagnation in the Air*, followed by *Corruption* and *Putrefaction*) ‘ are unneceſſary.

Remark. Not ſo; for Contagion is not the firſt Original of the Plague, but the Cauſe of its ſpreading farther than the Cauſe which gave Riſe to it extends.

Explainer, p. 7. ‘ Is a Concurrence of all ‘ the ſuppoſed Cauſes neceſſary to make a ‘ Plague? Then there never was a Plague in ‘ the World.

Remark. This Dr. *Mead* does not ſay; but only that more than one of them is neceſſary: For no more than that do his Words ſignify, *That a Concurrence of Cauſes produces Diſeaſes of this Kind.* Short Diſcourſe, *p.* 4.

Explainer, p. 8. ‘ Hard and continued froſty Weather produces the Peſtilence, moſt ‘ commonly, in our Northern Climates.

Remark. This is utterly falſe; for the Plague is never produced here without imported Contagion; and beſides, cold Weather

is

is known to reſiſt it very much. Did not the Plague ſtop very much laſt Winter in *France*, ſo that at *Marſeilles* they thought themſelves well nigh clear of it? and did not it break out again when the Weather grew hot? The Contagion which brought the Plague among us laſt time was brought at the latter End of the Year 1664; but did it not lie quiet without deſtroying above half a Score Perſons all the cold Weather, till the Summer Heat put it in Action? and did not the next Winter wholly ſuppreſs it?

Explainer, p. 9. ‘ If we conſult the *Paris* ‘ Article in the *London Gazette* for *July* 21ſt, ‘ 1721; there it is ſaid, that *the Court has re-* ‘ *ceived a Letter from the Marquiſs* de Pons, ‘ *who commands at* Toulon, *with Advice, that* ‘ *the* hot Weather *had much* diminiſhed *the* ‘ Plague *in that City.*

Remark. All that follows from hence is, that the Marquiſs *de Pons* was miſtaken as to the Cauſe which made the Plague abate at *Toulon:* For the Accounts of all Plagues ſhew, that uſually they occaſion the greateſt Mortality in the hotteſt Seaſon; which was manifeſtly the Caſe of our laſt Plague.

Explainer, p. 10. ‘ *Putrefaction* does not al- ‘ ways precede *Fermentation.*

Remark. Here Dr. *Mead* is cenſur'd, for ſaying Putrefaction is a Kind of Fermentation: But is it any Conſequence, becauſe Putrefaction goes not before *all* kinds of Fermentation, therefore it is not *one* kind of it?

All the Jeſts which follow, upon Fermentation, are very ridiculous; for Fermentation is certainly one great Principle, by which many

many of the Operations of Nature are performed.

Explainer, p. 11, 12. 'He (Doctor *Mead*) 'could ſhew us, *How the Alterations made* 'in the Blood will favour Peſtilential Diſ- 'eaſes, by rendring the Body obnoxious to 'them. Why, this is the Favour we have 'waited for in eleven tedious Pages.

Remark. No ſuch Matter; for this has no where been promiſed. It was promiſed to ſhew how Contagion acts; which is ſhewn: But the Doctor no where undertook to ſhew in what Manner the Air favours its Action. It was neceſſary, in order to clear up ſome Difficulties relating to Contagion, to ſhew that the Concurrence of the Air was neceſſary to it; but the ſhewing what thoſe Operations upon the Body by the Air was, which were required hereto, he might have explained, or omitted, as he thought moſt proper.

Explainer, p. 12. 'What Account can he 'give to Phyſicians, for thus deſpiſing the 'received Opinion of *Hippocrates*, and of 'all their learned and experienced Predeceſ- 'ſors, who unanimouſly declare, that the 'Plague differs nothing from a Fever; or 'elſe, that a Fever attends every Plague of 'Peſtilence.

Remark. Does Doctor *Mead* ſay, that the Peſtilence is ever without a Fever? Yet, as abſurd as it may appear to have ſaid *that*, this Writer is miſtaken in thinking our Predeceſſors in Phyſick unanimous in the contrary Opinion; for ſome have aſſerted the Plague to have been ſometimes without a Fe-

ver.

ver. *Septalius* gives the Names of many holding that Opinion, as *Savonarola*, *Jacobus de Partibus*, *Alexandrinus Benedictus*, *Clementius Clementinus*, *Suſius*, *Diomedes Amicus*, *Parey*, *Petrus Salius*, *Maſſarias*, vid. *Sept. de Peſte*, Lib. I. Cap. IV. To theſe may be added *Riverius* in *Prax. Med.* Lib. XVII. Sect. III. Cap. I. *Quercetanus de Peſte* Cap. II. as alſo *Diemerbroek de Peſt.* Cap. V.

I think there is a great difference between a Plague's differing nothing from a Fever, and a Fever's accompanying it; the firſt ſeeming to imply, that there are no ſpecifick Marks which diſtinguiſh the Plague from other Fevers; which is falſe, and well nigh contrary to what this Author ſays himſelf afterwards.

Explainer, p. 14. 'This Expreſſion, (*viz.* Glands of the Skin) 'does not give us any 'favourable Opinion of Dr. *Mead*'s Skill in 'Anatomy.

Remark. Why not? are there no Glands of the Skin? Do not the Anatomiſts call all Parts, framed to ſeparate ſomething from the Blood, by the Name of Glands? and is not perſpirable Matter conſtantly ſeparated thro' the Skin?

Explainer, ibid. 'Why upon the Glands of 'the Mouth? Surely this Suppoſition is not 'of any Uſe in this Place.

Remark. This is of great Uſe; for the noxious Particles being diſcharged into the Mouth, the Air, every time the Sick expirates, will be tainted with them.

Explainer, p. 15. 'I cannot tell how well 'he manages in the remaining Part of the 'Paragraph;

Paragraph; and therefore I will only ſet it in View.

Remark. I ſuppoſe the Meaning of this is, that this Author had nothing to ſay againſt it.

Explainer, p. 16, 17. 'There was old *Attraction*, Son of *Ariſtotle*; and there is young Attraction the great *Geometrician*; and a 'Counterfeit of this, in the Works of the 'celebrated Dr. *Anodyne Necklace*; which laſt 'is as like *Attraction* before us, as the two 'Doctors are like one another.

Remark. That is, not at all. Muſt a great Principle of natural Operations, ſupported upon undeniable Evidence, and the Diſcovery of the greateſt Geometer that ever was (I had almoſt ſaid, the only true Philoſopher) be exploded, and the Name of it baniſhed all good Writings, becauſe an ignorant Quack has talked of it without Meaning?

Explainer, p. 18. 'Here is a Devil rais'd 'indeed, that threatens to throw down this 'Paper Building; nor will he be quieted, un-'leſs Dr. *Mead* will contradict himſelf, and 'renounce his Defence of the *Pureneſs* and '*Uncorruptedneſs* of Air.

Remark. Has Dr. *Mead* uſed one Word to prove the Air uncorrupted in the Time of the Plague? has he not aſſerted, that the Corruption of the Air is one Step towards Contagion? The Paſſage here alluded to, is this; "*A corrupted State of Air is, without doubt, "neceſſary to give thoſe contagious Atoms their "full Force,*" p. 13. It is very hard to ſhew what Contradiction there is in this. The Doctor's Deſign was to prove, that the Diſtemper is brought into, and ſpread in theſe

Countries, by Contagion only; but yet, that the Matter of Contagion may ſometimes be brought here without very ill Effects; and that it exerts its full Force only, when the Air is particularly diſpoſed to aſſiſt and add Strength to it. The laſt of theſe is evidently proved by the Paragraph here mentioned, and the former by the Paragraph immediately following.

Explainer, p. 21. 'It is aſſerted by thoſe 'who oppoſe this *Contagion*, that a Plague is 'ſometimes bred without it, otherwiſe it 'would be perpetual —— *Contagion* may *pro-* 'pagate, but not *begin* a Plague.

Remark. Dr. *Mead* ſays, the Plague is originally bred in the Southern Parts of the World by Putrefaction and the ill Qualities of the Air, and not in theſe Countries, but is ſpread into theſe Countries by Contagion.

Explainer, p. 22. 'If a Man does not ſwallow his Spittle, there would be no Danger 'from the Peſtilence.

Remark. Not ſo much; which gives Occaſion to a piece of Advice in Pag. 22d of Dr. *Mead*'s Diſcourſe. But this would not be ſufficient; becauſe Dr. *Mead* obſerves the Blood will likewiſe receive Infection in the Lungs, Pag. 16th, whence he adds to the foregoing Caution another, *viz.* to hold the Breath when near the Sick.

Explainer, p. 24. 'I aver, that it may be 'demonſtrated from the Nature of the Plague, 'that it never, or very rarely, is communicated from one Perſon to another.

Remark. This is a groſs Abſurdity; for, were it Fact, it were impoſſible to demon-

ſtrate it from any thing yet known to Mankind, of the Nature of the Diſeaſe.

Explainer, p. 24, 25. 'At preſent, we will 'content our ſelves to evince this Truth by a 'Demonſtration from Obſervation, and I will 'borrow it from Mr. *Graunt*: In his Obſer-'vations on the Plague in 1636, he ſays, it laſt-'ed 12 Years; in 8 whereof there died 2000 *per* '*Annum*, and never under 800; the which 'ſhews, *That the Contagion of the Plague de-'pends more upon the* DISPOSITION *of 'the* AIR, *than upon the* EFFLUVIA *from 'the Bodies of Men.*

Remark. What is produced from *Graunt* only ſhews the Concurrence of ſome ill Quality neceſſary, according to Dr. *Mead*'s Opinion.

Explainer, p. 27. 'What Account can be 'given to Merchants, for their Goods ſerving '*Quarantaine*? &c.

Remark. In all that is here ſaid concerning Goods performing Quarantane, Dr. *Mead* is treated, as if he adviſed a new Practice upon an Opinion peculiar to himſelf; whereas it is the general and current Opinion of the World, as appears by the Cuſtom of performing Quarantanes in moſt Places: And therefore, without any additional Reaſons, the Practice ought to be continued, till it can be proved very undeniably, that this is a Miſtake; ſeeing the Conſequences of neglecting it, if it ſhould prove true, may be very fatal.

Explainer, p. 29. 'Another new Conceit 'the Doctor would entertain us with, that 'the Matter of the Plague is an *Animal* Juice: 'But pray, good Doctor, of what Animal?

Remark. Is not Man an Animal? and are not the infectious Effluvia, ſuppoſed by Dr. *Mead* to be emitted from Men ſick of the Plague?

Explainer, ibid. 'Is Muſk commonly kept 'in Furs or Cotton?

Remark. Will it not be kept in Furs?

Explainer, p. 29, 30. 'Of all the mention-'ed Plague-Keepers, three of them are ani-'mal Subſtances, and but two of them of the 'Vegetable Kind. Mighty fine! and well 'ordered: But if we turn to another Page of 'this Book (*Pag.* 24.) we may find this uſeful 'Obſervation contradicted.

Remark. Here is no Contradiction; for, in the firſt Place, the ſimple Materials only are mentioned; but in the laſt, ſome of the Things made from them are likewiſe ſet down. And in the firſt place, not three only, as this Author ſays, but five are of the Animal Kind, and but two Vegetables; for they are Furs, Feathers, Silk, Hair, Wool, Cotton, Flax: Had Skins been here mentioned, as they might have been, Furs might have been eſteemed as no diſtinct Species, but made up of Skins and Hair; and thus would the Number ſtill have remained five; and the Number remains the ſame in the latter place, the Vegetable Kind, by excluding Paper, Books and Linen, which are compounded of Flax or Hemp, are three, the Number encreaſed by the Addition of Hemp, which is much of the ſame Kind with Flax.

Explainer, p. 33, 34. 'The Peſtilence has 'never taken a Journey hither, in all appear-'ance, theſe fifty five Years paſt: In all that

'Time

'Time *Turkey* Goods, (*viz.* such Goods as 'come from Places where Plagues frequently 'happen) have not ſerv'd a Quarantaine; a 'certain Proof that Goods very ſeldom, or 'ever, bring a Plague into a Country; and 'oftner find it there, than propagate it.

Remark. Here is proved no ſuch Thing: It is not ſo much as abſolutely proved, that infected Goods can ever be brought into a Country without infecting it; for Goods packed up in a Town or Port where the Plague is, may not always receive the Infection. But upon Dr. *Mead*'s Principles, infected Goods may ſometimes be brought without Hurt, when the Air is in a right State; and that the Plague is cauſed only when the Infection from Goods and an ill State of Air meet together.

Explainer, p. 35, 36. 'Dr. *Hodges* ſays, in 'the Winter 1665, when the People return-'ed to *London*, they readily took Poſſeſſion 'of ſuch Houſes wherein Perſons had died of 'the Plague, *&c.* without any ill Conſequen-'ces: Which overturns Dr. *Mead*'s Notions.

Remark. What Dr. *Hodges* ſays, only proves the Air to have received ſuch a healthy State, as diſſipated and ſuppreſſed the Malignity.

Explainer, p. 37. 'So that it was incum-'bent on Dr. *Mead* to have ſhewn the Diſ-'poſition that may be in every Man to re-'ceive and entertain the Plague.

Remark. This was not incumbent upon Dr. *Mead*; his Buſineſs was to explain the Cauſes which expoſe a Country to the Plague, by which the Government might take Methods to keep it out: Of the particular Advantage

ſome

some have above others, of not being so easily infected, he had nothing to do.

Explainer, p. 239. 'What could Dr. *Mead* 'mean by so gross an Oversight, in an Article too so material for *preventing* Pestilential 'Contagion?

Remark. This is not material to be consider'd, when we are deliberating about Ways to keep off the Plague: For what has a Disposition of some Persons to resist it more than others to do herein, especially seeing we cannot know, by any Signs, who enjoys this Disposition, and who not?

Explainer, p. 42. 'What real Security does 'he acquire, when his Reason is convinc'd, 'that the Plague of Pestilence is not begot 'by any *Contagion*, properly speaking? That 'this Plague is not propagated from the Body 'of a *sick* Person into the Body of a *sound*.

Remark. This Confidence, if it be ill grounded, may chance to cost any one dear.

Explainer, p. 44. 'The Doctor ought to 'take greater Care of his Memory; for, at 'two Pages off, he assures us, *That our Air* 'is not disposed to receive such (contagious) *Im-* 'pressions.

Remark. Dr. *Mead* only says, that there are Instances of the Plague's having been abated, and proceeded with less violent Symptoms, by the mild Temperament of our Climate, our Air not being disposed to receive (contagious) Impressions: That is, our Air is of a Temper which makes it not fall into this evil Constitution often to a great Degree; but when it does receive this Disposition, to receive it sometimes only in Part.

Explainer,

Explainer, p. 45. ‘Is any Plague in a Country without Consequence?

Remark. Without great Consequence, it should have been, for that is Dr. *Mead*'s Expression, which this Passage is design'd to ridicule. But the Question is easily answer'd; for should the Plague infect a House or two only, and then stop, it would not be of great Consequence. And I believe the Assertion of Dr. *Mead* to be certainly true, that there never was any Distemper of great Consequence among us, that is, which caused a great Mortality, and was called the Plague, but was imported from abroad. I am sure, nothing has been advanced, why we should not believe as much.

Explainer, p. 46. ‘Experience is of the ‘side of the terrible, but common Opinion (*viz.* that we are visited with the Plague once in thirty or forty Years.)

Remark. We have no Knowledge of this being so, in the earliest Times, before we had Communication with *Africa*, and the *East*; either immediately by our selves, or by the Means of our Neighbours.

Explainer, p. 48. ‘All foreign Physicians ‘declare it, (*viz.* the Sweating Sickness) peculiar to *England*; and that a Parcel of it ‘went into *Holland*.

Remark. The latter Part of this Sentence contradicts the former. But besides, it was likewise in *Germany*.

Explainer, p. 49. ‘Is this (*viz.* Sweating Sickness) ‘truly a Plague, feeble and weak thro' travelling?

Remark.

Remark. What the Deſign of this Paragraph is, I know not. Dr. *Mead* does not call the Sweating Sickneſs a Plague with leſſen'd Force, becauſe it did not kill many, but becauſe it yielded to Medicines, and was much more eaſily cured than the ordinary Plague.

Explainer, p. 50. 'That (the *Dunkirk* Fever) was neither an *Ephemera* of one, nor 'of more Days, neither did it terminate in 'twenty four Days.

Remark. Dr. *Mead* has not called this Fever an *Ephemera*: But I ſuppoſe this is ſaid, becauſe *Keys* calls the Sweating Sickneſs an *Ephemera*; and why the *Dunkirk* Fever may not be called an *Ephemera* as well as the other, I ſee not; for the laſt Part of this Aſſertion is a great Falſhood, few having it longer than twenty four Hours.

Explainer, p. 51. 'Hereafter neither of 'theſe (*viz.* Patients or Phyſicians) will 'think themſelves ill uſed, for Dr. *Mead*'s 'ſaying that a Phyſician (eſpecially if he 'hates or fears him more than the Plague) has 'miſtaken his Diſeaſe, &c.

Remark. This Paſſage, I think, clears up ſomething: I ſuppoſe from it, that this Pamphlet is written by ſome Pretender in Phyſick, whoſe Ignorance and Impertinence together, has made him inſufferable to Dr. *Mead*.

Explainer, p. 52. 'But if we conſult the 'Bill of Mortality of that Year, we find only '50122.

Remark. This is falſe; the Number in that Bill is 68596; inſtead of which, Dr. *Mead*, through Overſight has put down the whole Number of Burials in that Year. Upon this

Slip,

Slip of no conſequence at all, is built all this Page.

Explainer, p. 52, 53. 'He (*viz.* Dr. *Mead*) 'makes the Plague in 1665 leſs terrible than 'it was, *&c.*

Remark. Throughout Page 53, Dr. *Mead* is charged with not having ſet out the Calamity of this Plague in its moſt terrible Appearance. And ſuppoſe he had not, what is the conſequence? I am ſure the Method this Author takes of doing it, is very whimſical.

Explainer, p. 57. 'He has not been pleas'd 'to tell us where the Plague firſt begins, and 'in what Manner it travels into diſtant Coun-'tries.

Remark. Both theſe Aſſertions are falſe; for Dr. *Mead* ſays, *p.* 4, 5. '*Plagues* ſeem to 'be of the growth of the *Eaſtern* (that is, the hot Parts of the *Eaſt*) 'and *Southern* Parts of 'the World, and to be tranſmitted from them 'into colder Climates, by the way of *Com-'merce.*

Explainer, p. ibid. 'We have ſeen an O-'riginal *Engliſh* Plague, that came from no 'place in the World.

Remark. I ſuppoſe here is meant, the Sweating Sickneſs; but this is only a confident Aſſertion, without any Proof, againſt what Dr. *Mead* has ſaid of it; the Symptoms were changed from thoſe of the common Plague, by the benign Influence of our Air; does it therefore certainly follow, that it was not derived from the common Plague?

Explainer, p. 58. 'But as far as we may 'depend upon the firſt and philoſophical Part

'of this Diſcourſe, (*viz.* Dr. *Mead*'s) there is 'no great occaſion for either of them (*viz.* 'Quarantaines and Lazarettoes): We live a 'great way from the *South* of *France*, and the 'Doctor has aſſured us, that the Plague can-'not reach us by ſome hundreds of Miles.

Remark. Dr. *Mead* has given no ſuch Aſſurances; but ſays the Plague may be carried much farther by Goods; and therefore preſcribes Quarantaines and Lazarettoes.

Explainer, p. 59. 'But the Doctor perſuades us, that we at Home never knew any 'thing of *Quarantaines* or *Lazarettoes*, nor 'the People abroad; and that becauſe his Ad-'vice is altogether *new*, and what was never 'practiſed, neither at *Home* nor *Abroad*.

Remark. Is not this a moſt notorious Falſhood? Where has Dr. *Mead* ſaid his Advice about Quarantaines is new? On the contrary, he expreſly tells Mr. *Craggs*, in his Dedication, that he would ſee it differed little from the common Practice. Dr. *Mead* ſays his Cautions are of two kinds; the firſt, how to keep the Plague out of our Country; the ſecond, how to treat it, ſhould it enter. The firſt of theſe, he ſays, are little different from the common Practice; the ſecond, only differing from it. See his Words: The firſt which relates to performing Quarantaines, *&c.* '*You* '*who are perfectly verſed in the Hiſtory of* Europe, *will ſee Quarantaines are agreeable to* '*what is practiſed in other Countries, with* '*ſome new Regulations.*' The next, '*Concerning the ſuppreſſing* Infection here, *are very* '*different from the Methods taken in former Times* '*among us, and from what they commonly* do

' Abroad: *But I perſuade my ſelf, will be* ' *found agreeable to Reaſon.*

Explainer, p. 59. ' He might foreſee a ' Queſtion might ariſe about the time they ' (Goods) ſhould perform Quarantaine. —His ' Anſwer is fine! why we muſt ſet little Birds ' upon the expoſed Goods.

Remark. This Queſtion does doubtleſs ariſe, and can only be anſwered by Experience. Forty Days is the common Practice, and therefore that ſhould be continued, till Experience has ſhewn us to the contrary. Dr. *Mead* does not propoſe Birds as the proper Anſwer to this Queſtion, but only hints a new Experiment, and therefore ſubjoins, " But the " Uſe of this Fancy Experience only muſt " ſhew. *p.* 26.

Explainer, p. 59. ' But may not the At- ' tempt prove dangerous?

Remark. Wherein? It is not neceſſary to let theſe Birds fly away after they have been thus expoſed.

Explainer, p. 59. ' How beautiful are ſuch ' Preſages (of Birds leaving *infected* Countries) ' related by *Lucretius*, *Virgil*, *Ovid*, *Fracaſto-* ' *rius*, and other Poets?

Remark. This is the firſt time I have heard of its being proper to take Information from the Poets in Points of natural Hiſtory. And had this Author read *Lucretius*, whom he here pretends to commend, he would have known Contagion not to have been the Invention of Ignorance, as he has before ſaid.

Explainer, p. 60. ' And here we muſt ob- ' ſerve, that this Art of *Quarantaines*, and ' Lazarettoes, is ſo infallible, that we may

' blame the Civil Magiſtrate, and his Officers,
' if ever the Plague is ſuffered to come among
' us.

Remark. Who ſays the Civil Magiſtrate is to be blamed? Dr. *Mead*'s Words here referred to are, " In caſe, thro' a Miſcarriage in the " Publick Care, by the Neglect of Officers, " or otherwiſe——*p.* 31. Cannot the Care of the Magiſtrates miſcarry without their Fault? or is it a Reflection upon the Magiſtrates to ſay, that Cuſtom-houſe Officers ſometimes neglect their Duty? Further, how does it appear by this Paſſage, that Dr. *Mead* thinks this Art of Quarantaines and Lazarettoes infallible? Does not the Word *otherwiſe* imply the direct contrary? For how ſhould the Publick Care prove ineffectual, or miſcarry, if all Officers do their Duty; but by the Methods they take being inſufficient? If Dr. *Mead* had thought Quarantaines and Lazarettoes, as is here falſly ſaid, infallible, he need not have adviſed the deſtroying of ſuſpected Goods, in Caſes of imminent Danger, as he has done, *p.* 28, 59.

Explainer, p. 60. ' The Phyſicians are to ' be blamed, when the Orders of the Civil ' Magiſtrate are hurtful.

Remark. True, if their Orders are hurtful, and by the Direction of Phyſicians: But not always when they are unſucceſsful; for they may be the beſt the Caſe affords, and yet not infallible.

Explainer, p. 61. ' It appears by the *Paris* ' Article in the *Poſt-Man*, *Aug.* 26. that the ' exceeding great Care of the Civil Magiſtrate ' has proved unſucceſsful.

Remark.

Remark. It does not then appear to have been hurtful.

Explainer, p. 62. 'The ſame learned Author *(Mercurialis)* 'informs us, that burning *infect-* 'ed Goods was found to do great Miſchief in 'a Plague in *Padua*.

Remark. Judicious Author would have been more to the Purpoſe than learned, had this been his true Character. The Caſe here mentioned is yet diſputable, and can only be decided by Experience, which yet we have not, in a ſufficient Degree, to determine the Caſe abſolutely, whence Dr. *Mead* has left it doubtful; adviſing, at the end of his Book, to bury Goods deep under Ground, if Burning be thought unſafe.

Perhaps it may be thought, that I here ſpeak too ſlightingly of ſo very learned a Man as *Mercurialis*; it may therefore be expected I ſhould produce ſome Proof to confirm this my Sentiment of him: At preſent I ſhall give one out of his Treatiſe of the Plague. In his ſixteenth Chapter he ſets down one of their Arguments, who are of Opinion that the Plague has not its Origine from the Air, in theſe Words: *Secundò ratiocinantur, quod, ſi Aër fuiſſet origo aliquo modo hujus Peſtis* (Venetæ & Patavinæ) *cùm Aër ſit corpus continuum, deberet etiam ejus inquinatio continua eſſe; & idcirco cùm Venetiæ, & hæc noſtra urbs fuerint infectæ, debuiſſent etiam infici neceſſaria Vicetia, Tarviſium, & ſuburbia omnia Patavina, quod tamen ſcimus non eveniſſe; immo vero dicunt experientiâ comprobatum eſſe loca, valde proxima illis quæ erant peſte affecta, fuiſſe omninò immunia.* To this Argument *Mercurialis*, in

in his ſeventeenth Chapter, thus anſwers: *Ad ſecundam horum argumentationem reſpondeo, Aërem quidem totum ſibiipſi continuum eſſe; veruntamen nequaquam neceſſe eſſe, ut unâ parte Aëris contaminata, ſimul, & ſemel totus Aër contaminetur: id namque ſi verum eſſet, ſequeretur neceſſariò, in omni peſte totum terrarum orbem debere eodem tempore Peſte tentari; quod tamen à nemine fuit unquam memoriæ proditum, ut etiam exemplis demonſtrabo.* Now, doubtleſs, a Writer cannot be much applauded for his Judgment, who could think the ſetting an Opponent's Argument in the ſtrongeſt Light, is making an Anſwer to it.

Explainer, p. 62. 'His (*viz.* Dr. *Mead*'s) 'farther inveighing againſt Phyſick and Phyſicians, is the moſt ſurprizing, unaccountable 'Inſolence, that Man ever was guilty of: A 'Man that has done nothing, but to corrupt 'Phyſick; for thus he puts an end to a great 'deal of rambling Stuff, about ſhutting up 'Houſes: *The Management in former times 'neither anſwers the Purpoſe of diſcovering the 'Beginning of the Infection, nor of putting a 'Stop to it when diſcover'd.*

Remark. This Author here contradicts himſelf. Is Dr. *Mead* blameable for ſpeaking againſt ſhutting up Houſes? In Page 61 of his Pamphlet, this Author ſays, 'the Phyſicians 'in *London* might not have adviſed the ſhutting up Houſes, if they had remember'd the 'fatal Experiments of it in other Countries, 'recorded in Books of Phyſick.

Explainer, p. 63. '*Inſtead of ignorant old Women, we ought to have underſtanding and diligent Men.*

Remark.

Remark. This is a wilful corrupting of Dr. *Mead*'s Expreſſion, for it is a Piece only of a Sentence, neither that in Dr. *Mead*'s own Words. The Sentence in Dr. *Mead* runs thus: " *Inſtead of ignorant old Women, who* " *are generally appointed Searchers in Pariſhes,* " *that Office ſhould be committed to underſtand-* " *ing and diligent Men,* p. 38.

Explainer, p. 63. *Secondly, When the ſick* ' *Families are gone* (whither?) *all the Goods* ' *of the Houſes, in which they were, ſhould be* ' *burnt; nay, the Houſes themſelves, if that* ' *can conveniently be done.* He has now the ' late Fire of *London* in view, and recom- ' mends another general Conflagration of our ' City.

Remark. To the Queſtion *Whither?* I anſwer, into Houſes, or what is equivalent thereto, as Barracks three or four Miles out of Town, as the Doctor in the preceding Page ſays, *p.* 39. For the latter Remark, I aſk, How does it appear the Doctor thought of the Fire of *London* in this Place; and whether this Author imagines the City can be burnt a ſecond time conveniently?

Explainer, p. 64. ' According to Cuſtom, ' the Doctor contradicts himſelf on this Arti- ' cle, at the ſmall Diſtance of four Pages, ' where Fires again are condemned as pernici- ' ous.

Remark. Dr. *Mead* does not contradict himſelf: He recommends burning Things in which Infection is ſuſpected to lodge, in order to deſtroy them; and even thinks Fires may poſſibly correct ſome ill Qualities of the Air, which expoſe us to be hurt by Infection, ſhould it be

be brought; and accordingly does not condemn what was perhaps the Practice of *Hippocrates* before the Plague comes; but what he condemns is, the making Fires, which may give to the Air an additional Heat, when the Plague is actually present; and in this he is surely right.

Explainer, p. 64. ‘ *Peſtilentes Febres* (ſays *Raymundus*) ‘ *ardentes ſunt, & idcirco ab aëre* ‘ *fervido, & calente augentur.*’

Remark. What is here quoted from *Raymundus* is a very juſt Sentiment. Dr. *Mead* has not ſaid, that any of his Sentiments are new, tho' many of them are ſo; but only that the Practice he adviſes has not commonly been uſed before.

Explainer, p. 65. ‘ It was never the Heat of ‘ great Guns, but their Noiſe, that was re- ‘ commended, which is a ſort of Wind.

Remark. Perhaps the Heat of great Guns was never recommended; does it therefore follow, that they give no Heat, or that their Heat will do no Hurt? How comes Noiſe to be a ſort of Wind? I ſuppoſe, by Sounds being cauſed by a tremulous Motion of the Air; but the Parts of the Air are much too little moved out of their Places, by ſuch Tremors, to cauſe a Wind: On the contrary, when a Sound is cauſed by the Vibrations of a Muſical Chord, none of the Particles of the Air are moved out of their Places a greater Space than the Chord deſcribes in its Vibration. When a Church Bell, which gives a louder Sound, is ſtruck, the Motion of the Air is greater, the vibratory Motion of the Parts of the Bell being ſo; for here the Agitation of the Air exceeds not the reciproçal Motion by which

the

the Mouth of the Bell changes alternately its circular Figure. The Sound of a Cannon indeed agitates the Air yet more; but is ſo far from cauſing any Wind thereby, that on the contrary a Sea Fight of many Ships uſually produces a Calm. Add hereto, that when the Sound ceaſes, the Particles of the Air return into the Places from which they were firſt moved; and therefore this Motion could be of no uſe to blow away any thing noxious, were it great enough, as it is almoſt inconceivably leſs than any Wind.

Explainer, p. 65. 'As Fires are manifeſtly 'uſeful in Damps of Coal-Pits and Goals, 'why not in the raw Damps of Contagion? 'and if that is a true Experiment, why does 'Dr. *Mead* forſake *Hippocrates?* &c.

Remark. The Uſe of Fires in the Plague is no where recommended by *Hippocrates* himſelf in his Works. It is true, *Galen* ſays, *Hippocrates*, by the means of Fires, ſtopt a Plague that came from *Ethiopia*; but perhaps he only prevented its coming into his Country, by making Fires; that is, he made them before it came, and that Practice Dr. *Mead* does not condemn. But however that be, ſuppoſe Dr. *Mead* had contradicted *Hippocrates*, could not *Hippocrates* be miſtaken? It is certain, the making Fires proved very ineffectual, as well in our laſt Plague here in *London*, as in that at *Marſeilles*; as appears both from *Hodges*, and the *Journal of what paſſed in the City of Marſeilles*, &c. juſt now publiſhed in *Engliſh*.

Explainer, p. 65, 66. 'If all theſe new and 'reaſonable Inſtructions take effect, there will

'be no need of any Methods for correcting 'the Air, purifying Houſes, *&c.* To all 'which (ſays Dr. *Mead*) if the Plague get 'Head, ſo that the Sick are too many to be 'removed, Regard muſt be had. Now as far 'as I underſtand the Doctor, the Plague may 'get Head againſt theſe infallible Methods.

Remark. Dr. *Mead* neither calls his Inſtructions new, nor infallible; he only ſays, that he adviſes Practices not uſed before among us, and only ſuppoſes, they may poſſibly take Effect, or be ſucceſsful: And if they are the beſt Inſtructions that can be given, as I am confident they are, he may juſtly ſay, they are agreeable to Reaſon.

Explainer, p. 68. 'He adds, *For the effectu-* 'al doing of which (defending particular Perſons againſt Contagion) 'it would be neceſſary 'to put the Humours of the Body into ſuch a 'State, as not to be alterable by the Matter of 'Infection. Is this Phyſick? what Phyſician 'ever ſaid ſo before Dr. *Mead?*

Remark. If no Phyſician ever ſaid ſo, they ought to have thought ſo; for is there, I pray, any other certain Way of making a Perſon abſolutely ſecure againſt the Infection, when he is within Reach of it? This Author talks of this Paſſage, as if Dr. *Mead* thought it poſſible to make this Change in the Humours, contrary to the Sentence immediately following; which is, '*That this is no more to be hoped* 'for, than a *Specifick Preſervative againſt the* 'Small-Pox;' that is, not at all. Dr. *Mead* uſes this Expreſſion to ſhew the Uſeleſsneſs of the numerous Medicines which pretend to protect againſt Infection, and with which Books

of

of Phyſick are uſually ſtuft; for this Obſervation at once ſhews the Vanity of them, ſeeing they do not, nor cannot, pretend to any ſuch Effect.

Explainer, p. 68. ‘ And if Dr. *Mead* would ‘ have communicated ſome of thoſe wiſe Rules, ‘ that are to be found in Books of Phyſick.

Remark. He has put down perhaps all that are uſeful, and moreover added ſome excellent Rules of his own.

Explainer, p. 69. ‘ Now, if Diſeaſes take a ‘ Time before they are bred, then it is an ob‘ vious Conſequence, that Diſeaſes may be ‘ prevented.

Remark. This is no Conſequence; for it is poſſible that the Cauſes which produce them may be too powerful to be reſiſted, tho' they act gradually. Can the Small Pox be reſiſted otherwiſe than by keeping out of the Way of Infection? and if not, how ſhould the Plague?

Explainer, p. 70. ‘ *A ſpecifick Preſervative for* ‘ *the Small Pox*; which, we find, is far from ‘ being impoſſible.

Remark. Is this poſſible? or rather, is not this plainly having no Regard to Truth, in order to oppoſe Dr. *Mead?*

Explainer, p. 70. ‘ Let us ceaſe then to ‘ wonder, why ſo great Care is had to keep ‘ our *Houſes* cool at Page 47, and ſo little for ‘ our Perſons at Page 49 of the *Diſcourſe* (*viz.* Dr. *Mead*'s.)

Remark. All the Rules which are good and uſeful in the *Appendix* to this *Explainer*'s Pamphlet, are contained in this 49th Page of Dr. *Mead*'s Diſcourſe; and in the next (*viz.*

p. 50.) more Directions, which are not to be met with in this ridiculous *Appendix*.

Explainer, p. 70, 71. ‘ He mentions *Vinegar* upon the Authority of *Rhazes*, which is ‘ no more for a Perſon that affects a Character ‘ for being learned, than if he had recommended it from Dr. *Hodges*.

Remark. Dr. *Mead* is doubtleſs a Perſon of great Learning; but does he ſhew any Affectation of that Sort? If quoting *Rhazes* does not ſhew Learning, it ſhews Judgment; for ſurely the Phyſicians of the Country which is moſt ſubject to the Plague, are the moſt proper to be conſulted about it.

Explainer, p. 71. ‘ There is a greater Store (*viz.* of Medicines) ‘ for that Diſeaſe (*viz.* the Plague) ‘ than for any other, and ſome of ‘ them come well recommended for the Purpoſe of *preventing* ſpecifically.

Remark. Perhaps this *Explainer* is hammering out ſome ſuch notable Specifick; ſince thoſe for the *Looſeneſs* and *Gonorrhæa* are out of Requeſt.

Explainer, p. 72. ‘ His Medicines are of ‘ two ſorts; one Set of them publiſhed in a ‘ very ſmall Book, tho' there is a large Account of their *Virtues* and *Uſes*.

Remark. Does this Author mean here ſome Medicines publiſhed under the Name of Doctor *Radcliffe*'s Receipts? None of them are againſt the Plague. But let me tell him thoſe are excellent Medicines for the Purpoſes to which the Skilful will ſee they are deſigned. But the very ignorant Commentator upon them makes himſelf merry with them, by aſcribing

ſcribing to them Uſes for which they were never intended.

Explainer, p. 72. ‘ There is a ſecond Sort (of Medicines) ‘ which ſome worthy Gen- ‘ tlemen of great Families, and great Eſtates, ‘ have told us of; and theſe were the *Secrets* ‘ of an eminent Phyſician.

Remark. Dr. *Mead* pretends to no Secrets. But what is all this to Remedies againſt the Plague?

I have now done with Dr. *Mead*'s *Short Diſcourſe Explained*, &c. and hope I have ſufficiently made appear many of the Miſrepreſentations and Blunders contained in it. As to the *Appendix*, I need ſay little; for every Reader will eaſily perceive of himſelf, that it abounds with Trifles and Abſurdities: The former this Author would put upon us as Matters of Importance, only by calling the moſt common and known Things by out-of-the-way Names: Of the latter, I ſhall juſt ſet down an Inſtance or two.

At Page 79. there is this unaccountable Aſſertion: ‘ If the Blood was not to decay, and ‘ that it never wanted a *Supply*, our Life could ‘ neither be ſo long nor ſo eaſy.’ From whence is made a notable Diſcovery; for there is immediately ſubjoined this Corollary, ‘ Hence ‘ it follows, that Man is naturally mortal!

At Page 80 are theſe Words: ‘ *A Perſon* ‘ *with the worſt Blood will live longer by the* ‘ *common Supplies, than any one with the beſt* ‘ *Blood, but without thoſe Supplies.*’ That is, a Perſon labouring under the worſt Diſtemper that can befal a Man, for Example, the moſt malignant

malignant Plague, would neceſſarily be longer a dying than he would be, though otherwiſe in the beſt State of Health poſſible, by being ſtarved to Death.

And at Page 86. it is ſaid, 'That the moſt 'uſeful Time to an Animal is the Time of 'Sleep.' This is very ſtrange indeed! However, this Author does not think this always to hold good; for in the ſame Page he ſays, 'It muſt be particularly obſerved, that in the 'Plague much Sleeping is far more dangerous 'than the moſt obſtinate Watchfulneſs.'

Again, at Page 88, we find the following Words: 'Could the Fluidity the Blood ac-'quires in the Lungs, be preſerv'd in all other 'Arteries, the Blood ſhould be carry'd thro' 'all our Body, ready fitted and prepared for 'Excretion.' This Author had told us before, (p. 14.) that the Doctrine of Secretion had been perfectly well explained many Years ago. Now I want to be informed of the Doctrine of *Secretion*, to which this Aſſertion will agree; for, I am ſure, it is not conſiſtent with that Account of Secretion which the Author of the Treatiſe of the *Looſeneſs* has very much commended. That Notion ſuppoſes different Degrees of Fluidity in the Blood at different Diſtances from the Heart; that the Particles fit to form any of the Secretions, may approach, be attracted by one another, and combine together, as they are carried to the reſpective Glands formed for that particular Secretion.

I ſhall only add one Paſſage more of this *Appendix*, which though aukwardly expreſſed, it would be well for us Phyſicians if our Patients

tients would believe it. Page 76. it is ſaid, ‘ Was an ordinary Fever as much unheeded ‘ and diſregarded, as we find the Plague, what ‘ could the Phyſician's Skill avail us? And ‘ ſhould not every Diſeaſe become as mortal ‘ and irretrievable? Our Funerals ſhould be ‘ very frequent, but not ſo general; becauſe ‘ thoſe other Diſeaſes are not ſo common and ‘ Epidemick.

SECTION II.

I Come now to conſider Dr. *Pye's Diſcourſe of the Plague*, &c. wherein he has taken upon him to be Dr. *Mead's Refuter*.

Refuter, in the Preface, p. v. ‘ If the People ‘ are made to believe the Plague is communicated from ſick Perſons, and by Commerce, ‘ of courſe they will be afraid of catching it, ‘ and thereby be neceſſitated to paſs their ‘ Lives in continual Fears and Apprehenſions ‘ of ſomething very dreadful and deadly.

Remark. This is a Miſtake; for People do believe this, and yet do not paſs their Lives in continual Fears and Apprehenſions. When they are in extraordinary Danger, it is fit they ſhould fear.

Refuter, ibid. ‘ If the Plague can be conveyed by Commerce, then Quarantaines are ‘ proper and requiſite.

Remark.

Remark. Here this Refuter contradicts himſelf; for he employs §. 6. of this Book to ſhew the contrary; *viz.* that though Quarantaines would keep out the Plague, yet it would not be proper to enjoin them.

Refuter, ibid. p. v, vi. 'Fears and Frights 'expoſe us greatly to the Evil we are moſt 'afraid of. This is commonly ſeen in the 'Caſe of the Small Pox.

Remark. Will Fears and Frights of themſelves produce the Diſeaſe? if not, they may be of uſe to ſtir us up to ſufficient Watchfulneſs againſt it. How comes the Small Pox here to be mentioned? when in p. 10. of this Preface there are theſe Words: 'Tho' the 'Small Pox is a peculiar Diſtemper, whence 'nothing could be rightly argued with reſpect 'to the Plague,' *&c.* A ſecond Contradiction.

Refuter, ibid. p. vi. 'If theſe Notions pre-'vail, and the Plague ſhould happen among 'us, the Sick will be deſerted by Friends, Re-'lations, *&c.*

Remark. Does this affect the Truth of theſe Notions? or are theſe Inconveniencies great enough to make it proper to impoſe upon Mankind?

Refuter, ibid. p. vii. 'In ſhort, ſhutting up 'People within Walls or Lines, is ſhutting 'them amidſt, and expoſing them to Famine, 'Plunder, Murder, Peſtilence and Deſpairs.

Remark. Incloſing the infected Places with a Line, as practiſed in *France*, does not expoſe them to Famine; becauſe it is the Care of the Guards to ſee them furniſhed by the Country: Nor to plunder and Murder; for it is the

 Execution

Execution of the Law upon Offenders in thoſe Kinds, which protect all Places againſt them, and Juſtice is not obſtructed by thoſe Lines; on the contrary, they effectually hinder Criminals from eſcaping Puniſhment by running away. And the two other Evils, Peſtilence and Deſpair, Dr. *Mead* has provided againſt, by propoſing, that all who will, be ſuffered to leave the infected Place, having firſt performed Quarantaine in an airy Place within the Line, *p.* 54.

Refuter, p. xi. 'He (Dr. *Mead*) ſhould not 'have bid publick Defiance as a Champion, 'till he had, *&c.*

Remark. Bidding publick Defiance is to oppoſe the common Opinion of the World, as this *Refuter*; not to cloſe with it, and clear up the Difficulties which clog it.

Refuter, in the Book, Ch. 1. p. 1. 'That the 'Plague is a Sickneſs or Diſeaſe, and not a 'real Poiſon, as Dr. *Mead* ſays, perhaps by 'Miſtake.

Remark. Perhaps this is no Miſtake in Dr. *Mead*; for it may be both. Is not the Madneſs of Dogs a Diſeaſe in them? and yet all Authors agree in ranking them among the poiſonous Animals; and when they communicate their Diſeaſe to other Creatures by biting, are they not ſaid to poiſon thoſe Creatures?

Refuter, p. 1. 'That the Symptoms of the 'Plague in different Countries, and at diffe-'rent Times in the ſame Country, have been 'very various and different.

Remark. This is not true; there is uſually no other Difference than what ariſes from the

different Degrees of its Violence, or the Difference of Conſtitutions it ſeizes; as the comparing together the Deſcriptions of Authors fully ſhews, and is taught in particular by *Diemerbroek*, l. 1. c. 7. *in Notis* §. 2.

Refuter, p. 2. 'From theſe Obſervations it 'is evident, that the Plague is not always one 'and the ſame Diſeaſe.

Remark. This is not evident; for the Obſervations here referred to, are in the Sentence preceding, and in this other; *viz.* 'that there 'is not any one, or at leaſt not any one di-'ſtinguiſhing Symptom, which conſtantly ac-'companies it.' The Miſtake of the firſt of theſe, I have already ſhewn; and from this laſt it cannot be concluded, that the Plague is not one and the ſame Diſeaſe; for is not the Small Pox allowed always to be the ſame Diſeaſe? and yet there is no one diſtinguiſhing Symptom which conſtantly accompanies it; for in ſome few Caſes Perſons have died of it, before any Eruptions have appeared; in which this Diſtemper reſembles the Plague, for the Plague is never known to be without Tumours or Carbuncles, if the Diſeaſed ſurvive the firſt Attack of it.

Refuter, p. 2. 'And that it (the Plague) 'does not always ariſe from one and the ſame 'Cauſe, may be made appear, not only from the 'foregoing, but from many other Obſervations.

Remark. What the other Obſervations are which are not ſet down, I know not; none of the foregoing will do it: For is not the Small Pox allowed always to ariſe from the ſame Cauſe, though the Symptoms of it are as different in different Subjects, as the Symptoms of the Plague? *Refuter*,

Refuter, p. ibid. ‘ But I think one Inſtance ‘ ſufficient. Dr. *Keyes* ſpeaking of the Sweating Sickneſſes in *England* and *Germany*, makes ‘ the following Remark: *Moreover theſe* (the *Germans*) ‘ *are not hurt with our Air and Contagion, but with their own; and our own infects us, and not that of theirs: Our Contagion of this Year ſhews the former, and theirs of the Year 1529 confirms the latter.*

Remark. What is here brought from Doctor *Keyes*, can only prove the Cauſe of the Sweating Sickneſs not wholly to be lodged in the Air; which is the Uſe Dr. *Keyes* makes of it; but it will not prove, that the Cauſe of that Diſeaſe was not the ſame: On the contrary, ſeeing the *Germans* had it in the Year 1529, it is not improbable that they contracted the Contagion from us, who were moleſted with it the Year before.

Refuter, p. 5, 6. ‘ In the ſecond Page of ‘ this (Dr. *Mead*'s) Diſcourſe, the Doctor aſſigns three Cauſes of the Peſtilence; the ‘ Air, Diſeaſed Perſons, and Goods tranſported from Infected Places. The firſt of theſe ‘ is ſupported in that and the next Page, and ‘ proved, *&c.* But a little farther all this is ‘ forgotten, and the Doctor contradicts what ‘ himſelf before had been proving: for in ‘ Page 14. he ſays, “ On the other hand it is “ evident, that Infection is not received from “ the Air it ſelf, however pre-diſpoſed, without the Concurrence of ſomething emitted “ from infected Perſons.

Remark. Here is no Contradiction; for Dr. *Mead* has no where endeavoured to prove, that the Air, in theſe Countries at leaſt, of it

ſelf, or alone, can produce the Plague: On the other hand, his whole Deſign has been to prove the contrary: He only ſhews, that the Air is one of the Cauſes which muſt concur to give Riſe to it; and that it can hardly, or not at all ſpread far, without Aſſiſtance from ſome ill Qualities of the Air.

Refuter, p. 6, 7. 'If the Plague can be 'kept from ſpreading by the Means aforeſaid (*viz.* by ſtrictly preventing all Intercourſe of infected Places with the Neighbourhood) 'it 'follows, that Infection is not received from 'the Air without, nor yet even with the 'Concurrence of ſomething emitted.

Remark. The firſt of theſe Aſſertions does indeed appear, and is what Dr. *Mead* would prove: but how does the laſt appear? Does it follow, that becauſe the Air will not communicate the Plague to any one of it ſelf; therefore when it is impregnated with noxious Effluvia emitted from Men diſeaſed of the Plague, it ſhall not then be able to give the Diſtemper to others, by conveying into their Bodies thoſe noxious Effluvia; and even by adding Force to them by means of ſome hurtful Qualities it may be poſſeſſed of, though thoſe Qualities alone would not produce the Diſtemper?

Refuter, p. 7. 'But methinks, he ſhould 'have brought an Inſtance, if any ſuch could 'have been found, where the Plague had 'actually been kept from ſpreading.

Remark. How little is this Writer acquainted with Books of Phyſick? for he need go no farther than to the Works of Dr. *Sydenham* for ſuch an Inſtance; where he will find, that the

the Grand Duke of *Tuſcany* kept the Plague from ſpreading into his Country, when it ran all over the reſt of *Italy*, by this very Means *.

Refuter, p. 8. 'Let it be ſuppoſed, that the 'Plague had not reach'd the adjacent Villages, 'until ſome Perſons had found means to 'eſcape; how does it thence appear, that it 'had been confined within and by thoſe 'Walls?

Remark. It would from hence appear, that the Cauſe of it was not ſolely in the Air; becauſe this was a conſiderable Time, and, as Dr. *Mead* argues, the leaſt Wind muſt neceſſarily convey whatever noxious Quality reſides in the Air alone, even to a great Diſtance.

Refuter, p. 8. 'Plagues do not always 'ſpread themſelves with the ſame Rapidity, 'but ſometimes quicker, and ſometimes more 'ſlowly.

Remark. The Slowneſs with which Plagues uſually ſpread themſelves, is a great Argument, that they are not cauſed by the Corruption of the Air alone; becauſe any Diſorder in the Air muſt of Neceſſity at once diſcover it ſelf over a great Extent of Country, and very ſoon extend a great deal farther.

Refuter, p. 9. 'It might have been expect-'ed, that a Fact whereon ſuch a Notion was 'to be founded, and whereon ſo much de-'pended, ſhould have been ſupported and 'proved, *&c.*

Remark. This Author here talks, as if all Dr. *Mead*'s Opinions relied wholly upon this Fact of *Marſeilles*; which is no ſuch Thing. Doc-

* *Sydenham* Oper. p. 73.

tor

tor *Mead* does not, I ſuppoſe ſet down this as the only, or the moſt certain Proof which could be given, but as it was the freſheſt. For indeed Dr. *Mead* has all along taken for granted, that the Plague is propagated by Contagion; it having been the conſtant Obſervation of all Mankind for a long time, that it is ſo: nor indeed will the contrary be proved, though we ſhould allow the Plague to be tranſported into the Villages adjacent to *Marſeilles*, without being carried by Perſons. For we might ſuppoſe, that when the Mortality in the City was very great, poſſibly the Air might be ſo deeply impregnated with the *Effluvia* conſtantly ſent out from that Number of Diſeaſed Bodies, that a ſufficient Quantity might be conveyed by the Winds to a Village near, ſo as to infect People in it; and if this had been ſo, the Infection would notwithſtanding originally have been derived from the Bodies of the Sick. But till ſome ſuch Fact as this is clearly proved, it is unneceſſary to make this Suppoſition.

Refuter, p. 10. 'He (Dr. *Mead*) ſhould 'have proved by undeniable Evidences.

Remark. This *Refuter* talks here as if the Debate were about ſome ſpeculative Notions of little or no Importance, and does not conſider that the Welfare of Mankind depends upon it. Suppoſe undeniable Evidences cannot be had, muſt we not act upon the moſt probable Suppoſitions in a Caſe where a Neglect of any of theſe Things he would diſſuade us from, for Want of Evidence, might be followed by the Deſtruction (nay, I had almoſt ſaid, the Extirpation) of his native Country.

But let us ſee the Things he requires this Evidence for.

Refuter, p. 10. ‘ That not any one ſingle ‘ Perſon had been ſick of the Plague in any of ‘ the adjacent Villages, or without the Walls ‘ of *Marſeilles*, till ſome Perſons finding ‘ Means to eſcape, carried the Infection along ‘ with them.

Remark. It is ſufficient to influence our Conduct, if it be probable.

Refuter, ibid. ‘ That ſome Perſons, finding Means to eſcape, did go to the adjacent ‘ Villages, or any of them, and were received ‘ into them.

Remark. This is not at all neceſſary; to an abſolute Demonſtration it would; but that is not here neceſſarily required. If the Plague got not into thoſe Villages before ſuch Eſcape, it is a ſufficient Proof, that the Eſcapers carried it.

Refuter, ibid. ‘ That the Perſons eſcaping, ‘ and received into the adjacent Villages, were ‘ diſeaſed Perſons.

Remark. This is very trifling; for may not a Perſon eſcape with this Infection lodged in his Cloaths, which may give it both to others and alſo to himſelf after his Eſcape? And beſides, ſome who by their natural Conſtitution are not ſo ſuſceptible of this Contagion as others, may yet carry away with them enough, in their Cloaths, to infect others. Upon which Ground it is, Dr. *Mead* adviſes, in an infected Ship, to burn the Cloaths of the Sound, as well as of the Sick, p. 22.

Refuter, p. 10. ‘ And that the Plague was ‘ carried in like Manner into all the Villages,

‘ Towns,

'Towns, and Cities that were afterwards vi-
'ſited with it.

Remark. This is plainly ridiculous. In a probable Argument, as this is, is it not ſufficient, that there is no Proof of the contrary in any one ſingle Inſtance?

Refuter, ibid. 'Unleſs all and every of
'theſe Particulars can be clearly proved, what
'the Doctor (viz. *Mead*) has here ſaid, muſt
'by no means be allowed to be Fact; but in-
'ſtead of that, overthrow his Argument and
'his Notion too.

Remark. This is very ſtrange, they can afford no Argument, unleſs the contrary were proved; for if theſe Facts cannot be proved, yet they may chance to be true.

Refuter, ibid. 'Why ſhould not the Walls
'of *Thoulon* be as well able to keep the
'Plague out, as the Walls of *Marſeilles* were
'to keep it in?

Remark. So, no doubt, they were.

Refuter, ibid. 'We have no Account, that
'any body eſcaping from *Marſeilles*, either
'forced, or attempted to force their Way
'into *Thoulon*.

Remark. I think this is falſe; I have ſome Remembrance of ſuch an Account. But ſuppoſe we had no Account of it; does that prove no body got into *Thoulon*, either from *Marſeilles*, or ſome other Place infected. Might it not be done ſo privately, as not to be known? at leaſt, is not this much more probable, than that the Air ſhould preſerve its Purity ſo long after the Air of *Marſeilles*, to which it is but little diſtant, was corrupted?

Refuter,

Refuter, p. 11. 'If the Perſons eſcaping 'were not diſeaſed, nothing can be thence in- 'ferred in favour of what the Doctor has 'affirmed.

Remark. This is already anſwered.

Refuter, ibid. 'I anſwer, if the Atoms har- 'boured in a Man's Cloaths are not capable or 'ſufficient to infect that Man, whoſe Body 'they touched, and that perhaps conſtantly, 'or for many Days together; it is highly im- 'probable, if not utterly impoſſible, that they 'ſhould infect any other, much leſs many 'others.

Remark. I anſwer again, may not theſe Atoms be lodged in a Man's Cloaths without touching his Body, though his Cloaths do? Beſides, it is ſufficient if one Perſon be infected by this means, for that Perſon will generate a new Stock of Matter of Infection.

Refuter, p. 12. 'For as theſe Atoms are 'ſuppoſed, *&c.* to be very volatile, they would 'ſoon fly off, *&c.*

Remark. Are not Scents very volatile? and yet they will not ſoon fly out of Subſtances which imbibe them.

Refuter, p. 12. 'It is not likely they (Eſca- 'pers from *Marſeilles*) ſhould go to the adja- 'cent Villages.

Remark. Muſt they not have gone through them?

Refuter, p. 14. 'The firſt Mention we had 'in our Publick Accounts of the Plague's be- 'ing at *Marſeilles*, was in an Article from *Pa- 'ris*, dated *Auguſt* 10th, N. S.

Remark. The Journal of what paſſed in *Marſeilles* publiſhed by Authority, ſhews the Plague to have appeared firſt about the End of *May*, and to be declared the Plague at the Beginning of *July*.

Refuter, p. 14. 'In an Article from *Paris*, 'dated *Auguſt* the 21ſt. N. S. I find the fol-'lowing Paſſage, *Though the Contagion is en-'tirely ceaſed at* Marſeilles, *yet abundance of the 'meaner ſort die there, and in that Neighbour-'hood.* From the manner of expreſſing this 'Paſſage, one might reaſonably imagine, that 'the Plague had been ſome time in that 'Neighbourhood.

Remark. Is this reaſonable? In the firſt place this Account, in relation to *Marſeilles*, was not true; and what is ſaid of the Neighbourhood, is no more than what they tell us happened before any Appearance of the Plague.

Refuter, p. 15. 'From what has been ſaid, 'it appears that the Sickneſs was in the 'Neighbourhood of *Marſeilles* long before 'any Perſons found means to eſcape, and in-'deed almoſt, if not quite, as ſoon as it was 'at *Marſeilles*.

Remark. Hence we may judge of this *Refuter*'s Reaſoning; for firſt it is impoſſible to know how ſoon any might make their Eſcape out of *Marſeilles*; nor, again, does it appear that the Plague was ſo very ſoon ſpread beyond the Territory of *Marſeilles*, which had a Line drawn about it. It was the ſeventh of *October*, N. S. before it got to *Aix*, as is ſaid in the *London Gazette* of *October* the fourth, 1720.

Refuter, p. 16. 'He (Dr. *Mead*) ſays him-'ſelf, "But when in an evil Diſpoſition of

"this

" this (the Air) they (Atoms emitted from dif-
" eaſed Perſons) meet with the ſubtile Parts,
" its Corruption has generated, by uniting
" with them, they become much more active
" and powerful, and likewiſe more durable
" and laſting, ſo as to form an infectious Mat-
" ter capable of conveying the Miſchief to a
" great Diſtance from the diſeaſed Body, out
" of which it was produced." ' If this be
' the Caſe, then it is impoſſible that either
' Walls or Lines can ſtop the Plague.

Remark. This does not follow. Has Doctor *Mead* told us, that the Expreſſion *great Diſtance* ſignifies ſeveral Miles? To underſtand him right, take the whole Sentence. Page 12. " Theſe (*viz.* active Particles thrown off from " ſick Perſons) in Peſtilential Caſes, although " the Air be in a right State, will generally " infect thoſe, who are very near to the ſick " Perſon; otherwiſe are ſoon diſperſed and " loſt. But when in an evil Diſpoſition of " this, *&c.*" Now the former part of this Sentence ſufficiently explains the latter, cited by the *Refuter*, that when the Air is in a State which favours Contagion, not only thoſe who are about the Sick, will receive Infection, but ſome at a greater Diſtance, ſo as to cauſe the Plague to ſpread by degrees over a whole Town, and even to elude a Wall, by which a Street may be blocked up; and this will be infecting at a great Diſtance, in compariſon of what it will do at other times. But it does not follow from thence, that Dr. *Mead* thought the Infection might be extended a Mile or two from any diſeaſed Body; and if this is not, it may be ſhut in by a Line. This

Author ſeems every where purpoſely to join Lines and the walling up of Streets together, to hide the better the Weakneſs of his Arguments; but they differ much; Lines Dr. *Mead* approves of, walling up Streets he muſt diſlike, as being little different from ſhutting up Houſes.

Refuter, p. 18. 'Thus the Doctor has 'ſhewed a great many ways by which the 'Air may be rendred noxious, and occaſion 'infectious Diſeaſes, without the Concurrence 'of ſomething emitted from diſeaſed Perſons.

Remark. Dr. *Mead* has ſhewn no ſuch Thing, nor intended it, of theſe Northern Countries: He only ſhews what Conſtitution of Air in all Countries promotes the Diſeaſe, and the Cauſes which firſt breed it, he declares only to produce that Effect in the hot Countries; for no more than this is proved by the Authorities he quotes. And Dr. *Mead*'s Deſign is to ſhew how the Plague is bred originally in thoſe hot Countries, and how it is tranſported from them to us.

Refuter, §. 2. p. 19. 'Any body would think, 'in reading his (Dr. *Mead*'s) Diſcourſe, that 'when he ſays "Contagion is propagated by "three Cauſes," *&c.* he intended to aſſign 'three diſtinct Cauſes, *&c.*

Remark. No doubt he did.

Refuter, p. 20. 'And yet there are ſome 'Paſſages of his Diſcourſe, which are utterly 'inconſiſtent with this Meaning; for beſides 'what has been taken Notice of already, on 'another Occaſion he ſays, "A corrupted "State of Air is without doubt neceſſary to "give theſe contagious Atoms their full Force."

" Force"——'Conſequently diſeaſed Perſons, ' or Atoms emitted from them, cannot poſſi- ' bly of themſelves be the Cauſe, or one diſ- ' tinct Cauſe of the Peſtilence.

Remark. Each of theſe, no doubt, is a diſtinct Cauſe; muſt it therefore follow, that they can ſeparately produce their Effect? certainly the Word *diſtinct* ſignifies no ſuch Thing. Dr. *Mead* has ſhewn what Cauſes are concerned in ſpreading among us the Peſtilence, and treats of them diſtinctly one after another in Order, and aſſigns to each the proper Degree of its Effect. Goods import the Contagion firſt, infected Perſons afterwards ſpread it, being aſſiſted herein by the ill Qualities of the Air, and likewiſe by Goods.

Refuter, p. 20. 'The Doctor is no leſs in- ' conſiſtent and contradictory; for it is ſaid, " That it (infectious Matter) may be convey- " ed to a great Diſtance"; ' and yet, in an- ' other Place he expreſly aſſerts the contrary; ' his Words are, " that the Air cannot ſpread " theſe (Atoms emitted) to any great Diſ- " tance, if Intercourſe and Commerce with " the Place infected be ſtrictly prevented.

Remark. This is very impertinent. Is the Word *great* of ſo limited a Signification, that it muſt always ſignify the ſame Number of Feet or Paces? is not the Senſe of it very various, according to the various Occaſions upon which it is uſed? In the firſt place, the Doctor uſed *great Diſtance* in reſpect to a Room, in the other in reſpect to a Town, or City.

Refuter, p. 21. 'The ſecond Part of this ' Diſcourſe proceeds upon a Suppoſition, that

' the

‘ the Plague may be kept off, and be ſtopped ‘ by Lines, *&c.* which cannot be done, if the ‘ Cauſe be diffuſed in or by the Air; there- ‘ fore, according to this Scheme, it can only ‘ be cauſed and propagated from one Perſon ‘ to another immediately, without the Con- ‘ currence and help of the Air.

Remark. This Scheme only ſuppoſes, that the Cauſe of the Plague is not diffuſed by the Air to a very great Diſtance from the Sick.

Refuter, p. 21, 22. ‘ Becauſe none (if the Cauſe of the Plague be not diffuſed in or by the Air) ‘ then could be infected, but ſuch ‘ as had been near to ſome diſeaſed Perſon; ‘ whereas many Inſtances may be had from ‘ *France*, as well as from Authors, of People's ‘ having been infected, though they had not ‘ been near any Diſeaſed Perſon.

Remark. This, it ſeems, is deſigned for an Argument that the Cauſe of the Plague is ſo widely diffuſed by the Air, that Lines cannot keep it in; but it does not ſo much as prove, that the infectious *Effluvia* can be carried by the Air three Yards from a ſick Perſon, for ſound Perſons may be infected by Cloaths, or other Goods, which have been near the Sick.

Refuter, p. 22. ‘ The Plague is very ſudden ‘ and rapid in its Progreſs—— The Plague was ‘ ſpread throughout the whole Town of *Mar- ‘ ſeilles*, and from thence into the Villages ad- ‘ jacent in ſix or ſeven Days time at moſt.

Remark. This is utterly falſe; it appears by the Journal before cited, that it was above a Month in the Iſlands where the Quarantaine of the Goods, which brought it, was perform'd, before it entered the Town at all; and more-

over

over contradicts what was quoted from the Publick News in Page 14, though this Writer is so inconsiderate as to refer thereto upon this Occasion; for *August* 10th, the Plague was said to have been in one Quarter of the Town only; and, as far as appears by these Accounts, in *Augnst* 21st. it was so far from having spread over the whole Town, that it was thought to have ceased entirely. Besides, the Journal before cited shews the Plague to have been owned a full Month (*viz.* from *July* 8th) before this 10th of *August*. Moreover, it is not said in the forementioned Journal, that the Plague had spread into every part of the Town before the 18th of *August*, twelve Weeks from the Time the first Person died of the Plague, on board Captain *Chataud*'s Ship. This is one Instance, among many others, how rashly this Writer reasons.

Refuter, p. 23. 'If shutting up Houses cannot stop the Plague, *&c.* then for certain 'the Walls of Towns, or Lines, or Trenches 'cannot be conceived capable of doing it.

Remark. Why not? because the Infection may be conveyed by the Air from one House to another contiguous to it, does that shew the Air can carry it a Mile or two.

Refuter, p. 26. 'It follows, that the In'fection is not communicated from sick Per'sons at all.

Remark. This follows, it seems, from the *Refuter*'s having argued through the two preceding Pages what Dr. *Mead* never denied, but has shewn by the very Arguments this Writer has thought fit to repeat after him, *viz.* that the Plague cannot spread far from sick

ſick Perſons without the Concurrence of the Air. But how does this *Refuter*'s Conſequence follow from hence? Muſt diſeaſed Perſons have no hand in this, becauſe they cannot do it alone? Cannot this Writer conceive how two Cauſes, neither of themſelves ſufficient, may by uniting produce an Effect?

Refuter, §. 3. p. 27. 'It is not conceivable 'it (conveying the Plague from one Country to another) 'can be done by Land; becauſe 'Perſons ſick of the Plague can neither have 'Diſpoſition nor Ability to travel by Land.

Remark. This Blunder I have already obviated.

Refuter, p. 27. 'And though the Sick may 'travel with more Eaſe by Sea, yet, *&c.*

Remark. This Argument is like the other. May not thoſe of the Ship, who eſcape the Infection, eſcape it by their particular Diſpoſition to reſiſt the Contagion; and yet may they not carry the Infection in their Cloaths to others, who enjoy not ſuch a Diſpoſition?

Refuter, p. 28. 'But in Caſe any of the 'Ship's Crew ſhould be ſeized before its De-'parture from the Place infected; yet after its 'Departure, even according to what the 'Doctor ſays, the Sickneſs can go no farther, 'unleſs we ſuppoſe the ſame corrupted State of 'Air to be continued all the way.

Remark. This is not according to what Dr. *Mead* ſays, but the contrary. Dr. *Mead* does not ſay, a corrupted State of Air is neceſſary for theſe infectious Particles to act at all, but only to give them full Force, ſo as to ſpread the Sickneſs over a whole Town or Country; for, on the contrary he ſays, they

 may

may infect ſuch as are near the Sick, tho' the Air be in a right State; and all in a Ship are very near together.

Refuter, p. 29. 'It (the Plague) cannot be 'communicated in a Country where the Cli-'mate or Qualities of the Air are different 'from thoſe, by the Concurrence of which 'the Plague had been produced.

Remark. How does this appear univerſally? If this Author means Qualities quite different, the Plague will not be ſpread; if he means only different in Degree, it may.

Refuter, p. 30, 31. 'Now beſides other 'bad Qualities of the Air, it has been gene-'rally obſerved, there goes before, or accom-'panies the Plague in thoſe Countries, great 'and continued Heat, or Heat and Moiſture 'together, ſuch Heat, for Inſtance, as the 'Nature of our Climate cannot admit of.

Remark. Not indeed in ſo great a Degree; but does it appear that theſe ill Qualities are required in as great a Degree, to promote Infection, as to breed the Plague at firſt? this is nothing likely: Therefore our Air may ſometimes poſſeſs the ill Qualities requiſite in a Degree ſufficient to promote this Contagion, when imported. Dr. *Mead* allows our Air not to be corrupted ſo eminently as that of *Afri-ca*, and therefore the Plague never originally is bred in theſe Parts.

Refuter, p. 32. 'If the Plague had ſpread 'it ſelf through *China*, the *Eaſt-Indies*, *Syria*, '*Turkey*, *Ægypt*, *Greece*, *Africa*——now as 'theſe Countries are vaſtly diſtant and re-'mote, it is abſurd to imagine the Plague 'could be ſpread thro' ſo great Part of the

'World in ſo ſhort a Space of Time, not by 'Means of the Air, but by a Communication 'from Perſon to Perſon only?

Remark. Do not every one of theſe Countries border upon ſome one of the reſt?

Refuter, p. 32. 'And as there is not a con-'tinual current Commerce between them.

Remark. Not between thoſe moſt diſtant from each other; but no doubt there was enough for this Purpoſe between thoſe that were next contiguous.

Refuter, p. 35. 'Here we ſee it is declared 'contrary to what Dr. *Mead* ſays, that this 'Diſeaſe (*viz.* Sweating Sickneſs) was not fo-'reign.

Remark. This indeed ſeems to be Dr. *Keyes*'s Opinion, though he does not expreſly, in the Paſſage here quoted, ſay that; yet ſince he informs us ſome were of another Mind, why may not likewiſe Dr. *Mead?* Is *Keyes*'s Opinion an undeniable Proof?

Refuter, p. 36. 'It does not follow, that it 'ever entred into their Thoughts that it was 'brought from the Siege of *Rhodes*.

Remark. Perhaps the Paſſage quoted by this Writer from Dr. *Keyes* does not ſtrictly prove what Dr. *Mead* ſays; but there is another Paſſage in that Author, which does prove it. In p. 53, 54. *Nov. Edit.* there are theſe Words, '*Sed demus* Trojano, Cantabrico, *aut* Rhodi-'enſi *bello (uti ſuſpicantur quidam) non* Bri-'tannico *ſolo morbum hunc natum eſſe:* Grant 'this Diſeaſe to have taken its Birth at the '*Trojan*, *Cantabrian*, or *Rhodian* War (as ſome 'ſuſpect) and not in the *Britiſh* Soil.' Now is it not evident, that they who ſuppoſed the Diſeaſe

Diſeaſe not to have had its Birth here, muſt of neceſſity ſuppoſe it tranſported from ſome Place of its Birth, and certainly from *Rhodes*, where it was no longer than four Years before?

Refuter, §. 4. p. 36. 'He (Dr. *Mead*) has 'no where clearly or expreſly declared, what 'it is that Goods receive and convey, whether it be the Poiſon ſuppoſed by him to be 'generated in the *Eaſtern* and *Southern* Parts, 'or whether it be ſomething emitted.

Remark. It is no matter which, for both will have the ſame Effect.

Refuter, p. 37. 'As our Trade with *Turkey* 'has very much encreaſed ſince the Year 1665, 'we ought to have had more frequent Returns of the Plague ſince that Time, than 'before.

Remark. This does not follow; for the Abſence of the requiſite ill State of Air is ſufficient to prevent that.

Refuter, p. 37. 'If Goods are ſo ſuſceptible 'and retentive of Infection, as the Notion 'ſuppoſes, then ſuch Perſons as firſt unpack 'and open Goods brought from infected Places, 'would very often have been infected thereby.

Remark. Dr. *Mead* does not ſay how ſuſceptible they are; but only that they are ſo ſuſceptible as ſometimes to occaſion the Miſchief. And if this be but ſeldom, yet the Conſequence is ſo fatal, that we ought always to guard againſt it.

Refuter, ibid. 'If it be admitted, that In'fection is conveyed into them (Goods) by 'means of the Air, then Walls, Lines, and 'Quarantaines muſt be uſeleſs.

Remark. This at moſt will only ſhew theſe Things uſeleſs in the Places, where the Goods receive their Infection, and not where they are afterwards brought.

Refuter, p. 38. ‘ The *Europeans* ſometimes ‘ have not been infected in *Turkey*, when the ‘ Plague has raged there among the Natives.

Remark. Becauſe they either remove out of the Way of it, or ſhut themſelves up; but at *Smyrna* the *French* Merchants, who uſe not that Caution, do ſeldom eſcape it.

Refuter, ibid. ‘ Nay, Dr. *Mead* ſays him- ‘ ſelf, that all Plagues do not indifferently af- ‘ fect all Kinds of living Creatures. Whence ‘ it may be inferred, that the Cauſe of the ‘ Plague is not one and the ſame Thing, *&c.*

Remark. This only ſhews, that the Plague Men are ſubject to, and that which affects other Animals, is not the ſame.

Refuter, p. 39. ‘ Plagues happening at dif- ‘ ferent Times, though in the ſame Country, ‘ have been obſerved to vary very much in ‘ their Symptoms.

Remark. Not more than the different Kinds of Small Pox differ; excepting only the Sweating Sickneſs, in which Dr. *Mead* ſuppoſes the Nature of the Contagion to be altered by the Quality of the Air it met with.

Refuter, ibid. ‘ The Sweating Sickneſs here ‘ in *England* was as different from the laſt ‘ Plague we had in 1665, as any two Diſtem- ‘ pers can well be.

Remark. Perhaps not quite ſo different; for they were both more mortal than any other Diſtempers ever are. But even ſuppoſe the Sweating Sickneſs had not the ſame Original

as the Plague, is only follows, that Quarantaines may not therefore keep out the Sweating Sickneſs, not that they will not keep out the common Plague.

Refuter, p. 39. ‘ If the Cauſe of the Diſ-
‘ eaſe was a ſpecifick Poiſon, *&c.* the ſame
‘ Methods would at all times be found uſe-
‘ ful.

Remark. This is no Conſequence, any more than that the ſame Methods ſhould always be uſeful in the Small Pox; both Diſtempers muſt be treated differently, when they are in a leſs Degree, from what they muſt be when in a greater.

Refuter, ibid. ‘ The ſame bad Qualities of
‘ Air as are neceſſary to put the Seeds of Con-
‘ tagion into Action in their native Climate,
‘ muſt undoubtedly be neceſſary in any other
‘ Climate, which is not natural to them; but
‘ the ſame bad Qualities of Air are never like
‘ to happen in *England*; and therefore, *&c.*

Remark. This is already anſwered; for the ſame bad Qualities do occur here, tho' in a leſs Degree.

Refuter, p. 40. ‘ *Hodges*, *Bellini*, and others,
‘ have taken Notice of certain Signs, that are
‘ wont to precede the breaking out of the
‘ Plague. We may judge from them of the
‘ evil Diſpoſition and Tendency of the Air;
‘ but they cannot poſſibly be ſuppoſed to pre-
‘ ſignify, that a Ship is coming from *Turkey*
‘ with a Bale of infected Goods.

Remark. Here this *Refuter* ſeems to depart a little from his affected Gravity. But we ſhall anſwer with great Sobriety, that they ſhew therefore only, that if Contagion ſhould be imported

imported by any means, the Plague will be like to follow; but theſe Signs are not infallible Marks of the Plague's certain coming.

Refuter, p. 41. 'They write from thence *(viz. Smyrna)* 'they never enjoyed a better 'State of Health. Thus, it is ſeen, Plagues 'will not be carried from Place to Place.

Remark. This Page only ſhews the preſent Air of *Smyrna* not diſpoſed to receive Contagion.

Refuter, p. 42. 'The other is an Account 'from *Boccacio* of two Hogs, which died 'within an Hour after they had torn with 'their Teeth, *&c.* ſome Rags which came 'from a Man dead of the Sickneſs. It is 'very probable, theſe Hogs had before re-'ceived the Diſeaſe, *&c.*

Remark. This is a very bold way of eluding an Argument. How is this probable, unleſs other Hogs had likewiſe been found to be infected?

Refuter, §. 5. p. 44. 'Now if it be likely, 'that in Winter the Contagion may not be 'taken out of Goods, *&c.* then Quarantaines 'in Winter will be a very precarious and un-'certain Means, if they are not altogether uſe-'leſs.

Remark. What does this prove? that Quarantaines in Winter are not to be enjoined? Does it not rather prove, that no Goods ſhould be diſmiſſed out of Quarantaine during the Winter? But what if this Warmth of Summer may be ſupplied at the eaſy Rate of making Fires in the *Lazaretto's*.

Refuter, p. 44. 'If the Perſons, who firſt 'unpack the Goods coming from infected

'Places

' Places in the *Lazaretto*'s Abroad, are never ' injured thereby; and I cannot hear of any ' Inſtance that they ever have.

Remark. The Journal of what paſſed at *Marſeilles* affords more than one undeniable Inſtance hereof.

Refuter, p. 44. ' The enforcing Quaran- ' taines will certainly and inevitably encreaſe ' the Running of Goods; by which means we ' may be as much expoſed to the Plague, *&c.* ' as if Quarantaines were not enjoined.

Remark. Not ſo much, unleſs all the Goods are run, ſo that none perform Quarantaine. Beſides this only relates to one Caſe; for Quarantaines are oftenеſt enjoined, in regard of Places from whence Goods are ſcarce ever run: Which is even the preſent Caſe; for the Plague is not at preſent in any of the Ports in *France*, to which the Owlers Trade.

Refuter, p. 45. ' Such Goods as are clan- ' deſtinely run on Shore, will probably be ' kept more cloſe (that is, than Goods not run) ' and therefore be the more likely to re- ' tain the Infection.

Remark. Will hiding Goods in a Cellar or other obſcure Place, cauſe them to retain Infection longer than ſhutting them up in a Warehouſe? But what has the length of Time to do, in which Goods brought here may retain their infectious Qualities? if they retain them but long enough to infect one Perſon, they have done all the Miſchief we need to fear from them.

Refuter, p. 45. §. 4. If *Lazarettoes*, &c.

Remark.

Remark. This Article only ſhews, that Goods when firſt brought into a *Lazaretto*, ſhould not be promiſcuouſly mixed with thoſe, which have before been airing; nor Perſons at their firſt coming be permitted freely to converſe with thoſe, who have been there ſome Time.

Refuter, p. 46. 'If the Seeds of Contagion 'can be brought by Perſons and Goods, then 'the making *Lazaretto*'s muſt be erecting and 'eſtabliſhing ſo many Storehouſes or Seminaries of Contagion.

Remark. For this Reaſon Dr. *Mead* directs them to be built remote from any Habitations in ſmall Iſlands. But beſides, theſe *Lazaretto*'s will not be ſo very replete with infectious Matter, as is here fancied, ſince the Goods brought into them are but ſeldom infected.

Refuter, p. 47. 'By the Motion of the 'Air, they (the Seeds of Contagion diſcharged from Goods in a *Lazaretto*) 'may be conveyed farther and farther, ſo as to ſpread 'the Infection not only all over the *Lazaretto*, but likewiſe to the adjacent Villages.

Remark. Dr. *Mead* has ſhewn, that theſe Seeds of Contagion are ſcarce ever ſpread ſo far.

Refuter, p. 47. 'And we find in fact they (Quarantaines) 'are not ſufficient for keeping 'off the Plague.

Remark. Theſe Facts only ſhew them not to be infallible, but do not ſhew them to be never effectual. And all that follows in Page 48, is of the ſame kind. And that they are moſtly effectual, appears, that by a careful Obſervance of Quarantaines, the *European* Coaſt

Coaſt of the *Mediterranean* is much ſeldomer infected than the *African* ſide. Beſides, this is farther confirmed from hence, that the *Morea*, when in the Hands of the *Venetians*, by theſe Means, is rarely viſited with the Plague; but when in Poſſeſſion of the *Turks*, it does not eſcape Infection for three Years together: Which cannot ariſe from the Poverty of the Inhabitants, when they are ſubject to the *Turk*, exceeding what it is when they are under the *Venetian*; or any Fears and Conſternations they are more ſubject to in the firſt Caſe, than in the latter; which are the only great Cauſes ſuppoſed by Dr. *Pye* to enforce a Peſtilential State of Air; by reaſon it will be eaſily allowed, that no Government is harder upon their common Subjects, than that of *Venice*. See Dr. *Pye*'s Second Part, p. 16, 17.

Refuter, p. 49. 'As to burning of Ships or 'Goods, that can never be of any Service, '*&c.* for whatever infectious Matter may re- 'ſide in the Ships or Goods, the Heat of the 'Fire will neceſſarily throw it all at once in- 'to the Air, *&c.*

Remark. This only ſhews, that theſe Things ſhould be burnt at a great Diſtance from any Habitations; and perhaps that the Perſons concerned in it ſhould be obliged to a Quarantaine afterwards.

Refuter, §. 6. p. 50. 'But let it be ſuppoſed, that 'Quarantaines could be enforced, ſo as to be- 'come an effectual Means of Security; I am 'perſuaded it might ſtill be made appear, it 'would not be for the Intereſt of this Nation 'to enforce them.

Remark. I need ſay little of this whole Section; for I am perſuaded the moſt intereſted Trader cannot think there is any thing in it. I ſhall only aſk, whether any one in his right Mind can imagine, that from the Time of the laſt Plague to this very Hour, the Number of Families brought to Poverty merely by Quarantaines, if there have indeed been any ſuch, is any way to be mentioned or compared with the Number deſtroyed in that one Year by the Plague, in the City of *London* only?

Refuter, §. 7. p. 55. 'The Doctor (Dr. *Mead*) 'ſuppoſes, that the Winter Seaſon does ſuppreſs it (the Plague;) but this could never 'be, if the Cauſe proceeded from ſick Perſons.

Remark. What does this prove? By the ſame Argument might be proved, that the *Tarantula*, the noted venomous Spider in ſome Parts of *Italy* is not really venomous, becauſe its Bite produces ill Effects only in the hot Seaſon, and not in the Winter.

Refuter, p. 55. 'According to this No-'tion, every ſick Perſon muſt emit vaſtly 'more of Peſtilential Matter, than he had re-'ceived.

Remark. What if he does? it is ſuppoſed, that the Juices of every ſick Perſon's Body are, ſome Part of them, corrupted into this contagious Matter.

Refuter, p. 55. 'And the Quantity of Peſti-'lential Matter emitted muſt be immenſly 'great.

Remark. The impertinent Calculations which here follow, conclude no more againſt a ſick Perſon being infectious, than they would

would do againſt a Roſe having a Scent; for a Roſe will have emitted Matter enough for as many Perſons to have ſmelt, as here a ſick Perſon is ſuppoſed capable of infecting. And was the Odour venomous and deadly, as is ſaid of ſome Poiſons, as many Perſons would be killed by it.

Refuter, p. 56. 'If the Cauſe of the Diſeaſe 'was thus tranſmitted, *&c.* it is not eaſy to 'conceive how the Plague, when once it had 'ſeized any Place, ſhould ever ceaſe, but with 'the Deſtruction of all the Inhabitants.

Remark. Dr. *Mead* ſhews how this is to be conceived; *viz.* by ſuppoſing the ill Qualities of the Air, whoſe Concurrence he proves neceſſary to ſpread the Diſeaſe, to be corrected, and the Air to be reſtored to a healthful State.

Refuter, p. 57. 'The Doctor has not told 'us, what he means preciſely by a corrupted 'State of Air; which, methinks, he ſhould 'have done.

Remark. Methinks he needed not. The Caſe is thus: Perſons diſeaſed of the Plague have been obſerved to infect others, and that the Plague, when it enters any Place, by this means ſpreads from Houſe to Houſe, and from Street to Street; notwithſtanding which, the Plague afterwards ſhall abate and go off, as if its infectious Quality were gone. This Dr. *Mead* obſerves to prove, that ſome ill Quality of the Air is required to act in Conjunction with the infectious *Effluvia* to make them fully contagious; but this does not ſhew what that ill Quality preciſely is; and therefore Dr. *Mead* was not obliged to ſay any thing about it.

Refuter, p. 58. ‘ And all Sickneſſes, which ‘ are general and deadly, are, properly ſpeak- ‘ ing, Plagues.

Remark. They are not always, properly ſpeaking, Plagues. But this Author has ſhewn himſelf, throughout this Diſcourſe, very ignorant of what Phyſicians have writ of this Diſeaſe, and if he has read at all, has certainly read without any manner of Judgment.

Refuter, ibid. ‘ How does it appear, that ‘ theſe Atoms emitted from ſick Perſons have ‘ any Share or Concern in the Affair? This ‘ the Doctor ſhould have ſhewn.

Remark. It was needleſs; it having been already eſtabliſhed by the Obſervation of Men in almoſt all Times and Places.

Refuter, p. 61. ‘ If, for Example, it ſhould ‘ be ſaid, that the Touch of a ſeventh Son ‘ will cure the Rheumatiſm, or any other Ail- ‘ ment; it would be thought enough to an- ‘ ſwer, that ſeveral Perſons having tried it, ‘ had found no Benefit thereby.

Remark. This is not enough; the concluſive Argument againſt this, or any ſuch Conceit, muſt be, that much the greateſt Part of thoſe who have tried, have found no Benefit.

Refuter, p. 62. ‘ If it be farther urged, ‘ that though ſome Perſons have been near the ‘ Sick, and have not been infected, this may ‘ be attributed to the Strength and Vigour of ‘ their Conſtitutions; I anſwer, it has never ‘ been remarked, that ſuch only have eſcaped.

Remark. This is perverting a true Anſwer into a ridiculous one. This is never aſcribed to a general State of ſound Health and Strength,

Strength, but always to ſome more ſecret Diſpoſition contrary to the noxious Vapour. And that this is no extravagant Suppoſition, every Day's Experience ſhews us in the Caſe of the Small Pox; for every one who has once paſſed thro' that Diſtemper, has afterwards got a Diſpoſition by which he is ever after protected from Infection by it, whether he remain of a ſtrong or of a weak Conſtitution; and no reaſon can be given, why ſome may not naturally have, in reſpect to the Plague, what all acquire in regard to the Small Pox, by going through the Diſeaſe.

Refuter, §.8. p. 64. 'When People die, either 'they have not at all diſcharged it (the Matter of the Diſeaſe) 'or not in any great Quan-'tity; for if they had they would recover.

Remark. Why ſo? May not a very great Quantity be diſcharged, and yet enough retained to kill?

Refuter, p. 64, 65. 'It (the Matter of the Sickneſs) 'is never ſo (by inſenſible Perſpiration, or by Breathing) 'diſcharg'd. This is 'evident, becauſe ſick Perſons are never re-'covered by means of an increaſed Perſpira-'tion, or by Breathing, nor do they ever find 'Relief thereby.

Remark. This is boldly ſaid; but how does it appear, that no Relief is had this Way, may not all who recover perſpire more than uſual? There is no Inſtance indeed of any being recovered by inſenſible Perſpiration only. Perhaps this is never ſufficient to carry off the whole of the Diſeaſe. But does not Dr. *Sydenham* teach us, that violent Sweating is the very beſt Cure of it?

Refuter,

Refuter, p. 67. ‘ Nurſes and ſuch as have ‘ conſtantly attended on the Sick, have eſca- ‘ ped much better than any others.

Remark. This is a hardy Aſſertion to be ſet down thus without Proof. If it is true, perhaps the Obſervation of *Diemerbroek* will explain it, That in the Plague at *Nimeguen* old People eſcaped better than others.

Refuter, ibid. ‘ Some of the Antients pre- ‘ ſcribed Amulets of Arſenic, *&c.*

Remark. This is a Blunder, in miſtaking *Darſini*, in the Tranſlators of the *Arabian* Phyſicians, for *De Arſenico*; which Dr. *Mead* has long ſince ſhewn the Folly of. *Eſſay on Poiſons*, p. 126.

Refuter, p. 68. ‘ Other violent Fevers, eſpe- ‘ cially ſuch as are termed Putrid, proceed in ‘ the ſame Way and Manner as Plague- ‘ Fevers.

Remark. Theſe Fevers do never produce either Peſtilential Buboes, or Carbuncles, without which this Writer has but three Pages before (*p.* 65.) affirmed no one in *France* to have recovered of the Plague. This then is another Contradiction.

Refuter, ibid. ‘ In all the more violent Fe- ‘ vers, thoſe Glands, (*viz.* of the Mouth) are ‘ always empty, whence the Mouth is dry ‘ and clammy.

Remark. This Drineſs proceeds not from the Emptineſs of thoſe Glands, but from the Tenacity of the Juices, by which the Glands are ſtuft.

Refuter, p. 69. ‘ As to thoſe who die, the ‘ Diſeaſe may be ſaid to have no latter End.

Remark. But very absurdly; for is not the Disease ended, when the Person is dead? and if so, is not a little before Death the latter End of it? But let Dr. *Mead* explain himself, who in his *Essay on Poisons* uses (in p. 174.) the Phrase here quibbled upon, and in p. 175. this other Expression, *the last Moments*, nearly in the same Sense.

Refuter, ibid. 'All malignant Fevers are 'said to throw off these Particles.

Remark. What Particles? not infectious, they are only called by Dr. *Mead* active; but in Pestilential Cases they are indeed infectious, as Dr. *Mead* rightly distinguishes, at p. 12. of his *Discourse*, which is the Place here referred to by this *Refuter*.

Refuter, ibid. 'If Diseases discharged by 'Buboes can be communicated in the Way 'I have been considering, the Venereal Disease 'would be so communicated.

Remark. This, sure, is the Masterpiece of this Writer's Reasoning; for he is here more than ordinarily unhappy in the Choice of his Instance, the Disease he mentions being it self infectious: And surely the meanest Capacity might have seen it not to be improbable, that if there is one Distemper that often discovers it self by Buboes, and is infectious in a certain Degree; there may be also another Disease, attended likewise with Buboes, that may be infectious in a still greater Degree, and that the Plague is generally thought to be.

Refuter, p. 69. 'But it is very manifest the 'Venereal Disease is not infectious to the 'By-standers, nor by Contact, except Vene-'real.

Remark.

Remark. This is not ſo; for Children and their Nurſes will communicate this Diſeaſe to each other.

Refuter, p. 70. 'If Plague-Sickneſſes, diſ-'charged by Sweat, can therefore be commu-'nicated to Perſons near, all other Sickneſſes 'diſcharged that way would be infectious 'too.

Remark. This is no Conſequence; Plagues do not ſeize on others, becauſe ſuch as are ſick of them have Diſcharges by Sweat, but by reaſon ſuch Diſcharges are infectious.

Refuter, §. 9. p. 70. 'If any kind of Mat-'ter, Venom, or Poiſon, is capable of produ-'cing a Diſeaſe, which can be communicated 'to others, *&c.* Sublimate, Mercury, Arſe-'nic, the Venom of Vipers, or of mad Dogs, '*&c.* would cauſe ſuch Sickneſſes.

Remark. How does it appear, becauſe ſome Poiſons will do this, therefore all muſt? By the ſame way of Reaſoning it would follow, that Opium does not kill by inducing Sleep; becauſe Sublimate, Mercury, Arſenic, the Venom of Vipers, or of Mad Dogs, *&c.* which are all Poiſons as well as Opium, have not that Effect.

Refuter, ibid. 'If any kind of Damps, Va-'pours, or *Effluvia*, are capable of producing 'an infectious Sickneſs, then Chymical *Ef-'fluvia*, or the Damps and Vapours of 'Mines, or Pits, *&c.* would cauſe ſuch Sick-'neſs.

Remark. This is no better Reaſoning than the former.

Refuter, p. 71. 'The Mortality at the Aſ-'ſize at *Oxford*, &c. was certainly, for the Extent

'Extent of it, one of the moſt cruel and 'deadly Peſtilences, *&c.* and yet they (the Perſons infected) 'did not communicate the 'Sickneſs to any other.

Remark. This does not appear to have been the true Plague; for there is no Account of any Peſtilential Tumors or Carbuncles appearing upon any ſeized; no wonder therefore if it was not ſo infectious.

In the foregoing *Remarks* I have made ſuch Obſervations on Dr. *Mead*'s and Dr. *Pye*'s Performances, and that ſometimes by comparing them together, as I queſtion not but every indifferent Reader will thence be able to perceive how very ſhort the latter has fallen, in making good what he boaſted in the Title-Page of his Pamphlet, that he had refuted Dr. *Mead*'s Notions. This is particularly apparent, where this *Refuter* attempts to ſhew, from the Nature of other Diſeaſes and of Poiſons, that it is impoſſible for the Plague, whether conſidered under either of theſe Heads, to be propagated by Perſons or Goods: For as to what he advances there as a Proof thereof, nothing was ever produced more mean and trifling, nothing more diſtant from the leaſt Shadow of a true Argument, by any one that called himſelf a Doctor in Phyſick. That becauſe ſuch and ſuch Diſeaſes, and ſuch and ſuch Poiſons, do not infect after ſuch a particular Way, therefore it is impoſſible that there ſhould ever exiſt any Diſeaſe or Poiſon that can infect in that manner, is ſurely ſuch a poor ſort of Sophiſm, that an Under-Graduate in any of our Univerſities would be aſhamed of

making uſe of it in an Academick Exerciſe. What therefore ſhall we think of a Doctor, that publiſhes it in Print as an unanſwerable Demonſtration?

This *Refuter*, in his ſecond Part, which came out about a Week after the firſt, would inſinuate, as if he had been much converſant in Books of Phyſick; for at Pag. 5. he talks of being able to prove ſomething by all the Writers from *Hippocrates* to Dr. *Mead*. If he had been this Book-learned Perſon, as he there ſeems to intimate; and was verily perſuaded, that the common Notion of Contagion, like that of Witchcraft and Poſſeſſions, was a mere vulgar Error, notwithſtanding it had prevailed ſo much in the World, he ought to have let us ſeen more of his Learning, and have ſhewn, that all Accounts that had been given of Plagues, and favoured that Notion, were altogether inſufficient to prove it ſo much as probable; as a Right Reverend * Biſhop of the Church of *Ireland* has excellently well done in relation to the Buſineſs of Witches and Conjurers. This would have been ſomething to the Purpoſe; but to go about to demonſtrate a Negative by a Way which was impoſſible, ſhews both the greateſt Preſumption and Weakneſs at the ſame Time.

As to this ſecond Part, I ſhall ſay very little. It affords, I think, ſeveral Specimens of its Author's Learning and Judgment.

At Pag. 5. it is ſaid, that (the Air) 'is even 'a neceſſary Part of the Fluids, without which 'they would ceaſe to be fluid.' And at p. 6.

* Dr. *Hutchinſon*.

'If

'If the Air could be entirely withdrawn, and 'abſolutely excluded from the Interſtices, or 'minute Spaces between the Parts of the 'Blood, or Fluids, their Coheſion would (of Neceſſity, or, as he corrects it in the *Errata*) 'probably become firm, and the Fluids would 'be rendred Solids.' Theſe Paſſages ſhew, how much this Author is acquainted with experimental Philoſophy: For we have no Experiment of any Fluid, which by withdrawing from it the Air included within it, makes any ſenſible Approach towards Solidity. And farther, no Bodies naturally ſolid can be kept in a State of Fluidity meerly by the Air being between their Interſtices, by reaſon that the Powers by which the Parts of ſuch Bodies attract each other, would be abundantly ſufficient to drive out the Air between them.

At Pag. 25. there is another Flight, *viz.* 'Every Blood-letting takes away ſomewhat of 'of the ſanguifying Power, which is the 'Principle of animal Life.' This is no way evident; for though the Chyle is turned into Blood, when it comes into the Arteries and Veins, it does not therefore follow, that the Power in an Animal to change the Chyle is proportional to the Quantity of Blood wherewith the Chyle is mixed. And beſides, the Quantity of Blood uſually drawn off in Bleeding, is ſo inconſiderable a Part of the Whole, that ſhould the ſanguifying Power be diminiſhed, as this Writer ſuppoſes, yet that Diminution would not deſerve any Notice, except in ſuch Caſes where the ſanguifying Power is before too weak, as in Dropſies, *&c.* I hope this Writer is not of the Opinion of ſome whim-

ſical Chymiſts, that the red Part of the Blood can never be recruited; ſince that Part of the Blood in Children bears but an inconſiderable Proportion to what it is in a grown Perſon.

At Pag. 31. he talks againſt the Abuſes of Bliſters in ſuch a manner as ſhews he knows but little what is really to be expected from them.

At Pag. 24. This Writer is ſo ridiculous as to ſay, 'that if Cotton was capable of bringing hither Infection from *Turkey*, the greater Quantity of Candles we burn, the more we ſhall be expoſed to the Plague, the Weiks of them being made of that Material.' As the Inconveniency of burning many Candles is thus argued from another's Notion, ſo this Author has a moſt ingenious Conceit of his own to evince the ſame Thing. For he has diſcovered, that a great Number of lighted Candles conſume too large a Portion of the Part of the Air moſt neceſſary to Life. But I wonder he did not conſider, that as faſt as this Air is render'd unfit to keep the Candles burning, and alſo according to his Notion improper to breathe in, that Air is continually carried off, and its want ſupplied by freſh Air; which is the Reaſon why lighted Candles are never ordinarily extinguiſhed of themſelves, as they ſoon are when incloſed in any Veſſel to which the freſh Air has no Acceſs. I admire, when this Author had it ſo much in his Head to demoliſh nightly Aſſemblies, he did not think of more obvious Arguments, and which may poſſibly have ſomething in them. For the Fumes of many Candles, ariſing from the Tallow whereof they are made, are

really

really found inconvenient to thoſe whoſe Lungs are weak. But Candles, in their burning, are ſo far from having any other ill Effects, that they take off from the Hurt of their Fumes, which is moſt ſenſible when Candles are newly extinguiſhed, and their Fumes are no longer attenuated by their Flame.

Theſe, and other Inſtances there are to be met with in this Performance, let us ſee how very fit this Author is to pronounce dogmatically, as he does in the 30th Page, where are theſe notable Words, 'If any Judgment can be 'made from the preſent Nature of our Cli-'mate, and other Circumſtances, THERE 'NEVER can happen a Plague here in '*England*, in which Blood-letting will not 'be found pernicious and fatal.' In the former Part this Author aſſerts (weakly enough) that every Diſtemper that is epidemick and deadly, is really the Plague. Now can this learned and ingenious Writer demonſtrate, from the preſent Nature of our Climate, and other Circumſtances, THERE NEVER can happen a Pleuriſy here in *England* both epidemick and very mortal, which then, according to his Notion of the Matter, will be a real Plague? And if he cannot demonſtrate this, then certainly there may (in this Author's Notion of a Plague) ſuch a Plague happen, wherein Blood-letting will be found neither fatal nor pernicious. Beſides, Dr. *Sydenham* has given Inſtances where Blood-letting has proved very beneficial in what was really the true Plague. But I am weary of following this Author through theſe miſerable Blunders: I ſhall therefore add but one more.

At Pag. 27. this *Refuter* ſays, 'Let none be 'afraid of attending the Sick (*viz.* of the Plague;) 'for, as I have ſhew'd before, they 'cannot poſſibly receive any Hurt, but may 'more probably find Safety and Security in 'ſo doing.

The latter Part of the foregoing Sentence, when this Pamphlet came firſt out, I obſerved every Body excepted againſt; they wondering how ſo ſtrange a Paradox could be proved. I believe this Author here has an Eye to what he ſaid at Pag. 67. of his firſt Part, 'That 'Nurſes, and ſuch as have conſtantly attend-'ed about the Sick, have eſcaped much bet-'ter than any others.' But as this is an Aſſertion grounded upon no Authorities; ſo this Writer himſelf ſeems to have thought it too bold a one to paſs without ſome Reaſon for it; though the Reaſon he has aſſigned is, if poſſible, much more ſurprizing than the Aſſertion it ſelf. For it is drawn from the extravagant Uſe ſome have aſſigned to Arſenick, of preventing Infection, ſuppoſed to be owing to the Arſenick's attracting the Venomous Particles of the Diſtemper in the Air to it ſelf. To make this an Argument, it muſt likewiſe be imagined, that the Body of an infected Perſon reſembles Arſenick in this Particular, of drawing to it all that is apt to propagate the Diſeaſe, whereby the By-ſtanders become free from Danger. But how full of Blunders and Abſurdities is this Reaſoning? At the Beginning of his firſt Part, this Writer believes the Plague not to be a Poiſon; but here the Body of the Sick of it is fancied to have the Properties of Arſenick. Then this Property

of

of Arſenick being a Security againſt the Plague, is as ill-grounded a Conceit as ever got Admittance into Phyſick, and is altogether owing to a Miſtake, as we obſerved above. And yet this *Refuter* draws from it a moſt amazing Concluſion. Does this at all ſuit with the Caution and Circumſpection he would make us believe he never wanted, both by the curious and important Queſtions he aſks Dr. *Halley*, in his Letter to him, printed at the end of the firſt Part; and the ſeveral Proofs he demands of Dr. *Mead* concerning many Particulars? But however, granting his Principles, that the Body of an infected Perſon drew to it the malignant Particles floating in the Air; does it thence follow, that ſuch as are near this Body, are ſafer than thoſe who are at a greater Diſtance? Does it follow, that one ſitting near a Fire with a Door open at his Back, can receive no Injury, by reaſon the Fire draws to it ſelf the whole Current of Air? Certainly theſe are no Conſequences at all.

CONCLUSION.

I Am at length come to the End of my Undertaking, which is no ſmall Pleaſure to me; for I think nothing in the World can be more tireſome than the Endeavour of clearing up any thing from Miſrepreſentation, and the Labour of anſwering Impertinence. And theſe have been my chief Imployment in writing the foregoing *Remarks*. The Author who aſſumed to himſelf to be Dr. *Mead*'s *Explainer*, has frequently given me the firſt Trou-

ble;

ble; and Dr. *Pye*, in his Attempt to refute Dr. *Mead*'s Notions, has conſtantly exerciſed me with the *other*. As the *Explainer* makes no Conſcience of wilfully miſrepreſenting what Dr. *Mead* ſays; ſo he as often fails in the Point of Reaſoning and Argument. He likewiſe many times aims at Smartneſs and Wit, tho' after a very aukward Faſhion; and is very ignorant of any true Theory in Phyſick, notwithſtanding, in ſome Paſſages in his Pamphlet, there is room to gueſs, that it is wrote by one, who in other printed Diſcourſes has pretended to great Knowledge of the Animal Œconomy; and to be able to account mechanically for many of its Operations. But this is a Taſk too difficult for one of this Writer's Capacity. It is not a pillaging of *Bellini* and others, and that in their very Words, that can get a Man a Reputation for Skill in the true Theory of Medicine; when what he produces himſelf, as well in this Performance, as in other Treatiſes of his, is beyond Conception weak and abſurd.

Dr. *Pye*, on the other hand, does not ſeem to pretend to much Knowledge in Natural Philoſophy; but where he makes ſome Eſſays in that Way, he is very unfortunate. Nor has he ſhewn any where in either Part of his Diſcourſe any tolerable Acquaintance with Books; tho' in one Place (Part. II. p. 5.) he makes uſe of ſuch an Expreſſion, as if he had a Mind we ſhould imagine him to be a Perſon of almoſt infinite Reading. The Tenour of his Diſcourſe is ſeemingly grave, and not a little Magiſterial. He perpetually aims at a ſort of Argumentation, delivered in a moſt te-

dious

dious Compaſs of Words. As to the Force of his Reaſons, we have fully conſidered *that* in the *Remarks* on his Performance, and concerning which we ſhall add nothing farther.

As it has been our Buſineſs, in the foregoing *Remarks*, to vindicate Dr. *Mead*'s Diſcourſe from the Objections that have been raiſed againſt it, by Miſrepreſentation and Impertinence; ſo upon a Review we are almoſt apt to think our Labour in a manner ſuperfluous and needleſs: For Dr. *Mead*'s excellent Treatiſe is delivered with ſo much Clearneſs as well as Brevity, that, I queſtion not, but if any one will read it over with due Caution, and compare it with any thing that has been written in Oppoſition to what is there advanced, he will readily diſcover the Truth to be on Dr. *Mead*'s ſide; and that he had produced nothing in relation to Contagion and the Plague, but what is to be deduced from the ſeveral known Phænomena of that Diſtemger. Indeed if ſome ingenious Beginner in Phyſick had attempted this Subject, he would probably have been more laviſh in his Conjectures at the Cauſes of the Diſeaſe; not being willing to omit any Occaſion of bringing into the Light part of that Stock of extraordinary Knowledge which he had lately received from the Mouth of ſome grave and learned Profeſſor. And this perhaps might take with the Generality of Readers, who are for the moſt part apt to admire what neither they nor any body elſe will be ever able to comprehend; and to ſlight what is natural and certain, and what it is poſſible to diſcover in the Know-

ledge of Nature; and what will direct us to ſomething that may be of real Uſe and Service. Nor may the young *Æſculapius* himſelf at firſt doubt of the Truth and Certainty of thoſe airy Speculations which were delivered to him by One, the Dignity of whoſe Office ſeems to require him not to be ignorant of any thing in the whole Compaſs of the Art of Healing. But Time and Experience, a ſtricter Search into the Nature of Things, and a ſteady Purſuit of a truer Philoſophy than what has hitherto been taught in the Schools, may at length inform him better, and make him diſcern how little Truth there is in the many Notions that have been broach'd by the Compilers of Hypotheſes and Syſtems. Then he may be able to perceive the Difference between Conjectures framed at random, and ſuch Knowledge of Things as is acquired from the moſt diligent Obſervation, and the ſoundeſt Reaſon; between what is uttered from a Univerſity *Chair*, only in a methodical Way, and what is produced by one, whoſe natural Sagacity, improved by Study and the largeſt Experience, has rendered truly ſkilful both in the Knowledge and Cure of Diſtempers. And the *Short Diſcourſe concerning Peſtilential Contagion* will, upon the ſtricteſt Examination, be found worthy an Author of this laſt Character; as being altogether ſuitable to the Learning, good Senſe, and Humanity, which every body who is ſo happy as to be acquainted with him, ſees and admires in Dr. *MEAD*.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAG. 12. l. 24. after the Word *do*, add *of themſelves in theſe Countries*, p. 24. l. 28. for *has* read *have*. p. 26. l. 29. read *relate*. l. 31. dele *Quarantaines*. p. 29. l. 32. read *Vicentia*. p. 33. l. 25. after *miſtaken?* add theſe Words, *For tho' it ceaſed then, it might not be owing to the making of Fires; ſince*

ERRATA.